

FRANCE'S SOUL-SEARCHING: FINDING NATIONAL IDENTITY IN POLITICAL METAPHORS DURING THE 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

By Cody P. LeBlanc

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for completion
Of the Bachelor of Arts degree in International Studies at the
Croft Institute for International Studies and the
Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College
The University of Mississippi

University, Mississippi
Spring 2013

Approved:

Advisor: Dr. Olivier Tonnerre

Reader: Dr. William Schenck

Reader: Dr. Allison Burkette

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my utmost gratitude first and foremost to my thesis advisor and academic mentor, Dr. Olivier Tonnerre, for his steadfast encouragement and support throughout the writing of this thesis. His expertise in the field of French language and culture proved to be invaluable in shaping the scope and focus of my research, and I continue to draw inspiration from both his personal character and his academic passion. Thanks to the past four years under his tutelage, I have progressed from Francophile to Francophone, and for his instruction in French I am infinitely grateful.

I am greatly indebted to the faculty and staff of the Croft Institute for International Studies, especially to Dr. Gispén and Dr. Schenck, both of whom have always shared their advice with unmatched sincerity and kindness. I am appreciative of all the professors whose classes I have been fortunate enough to take, especially my third reader Dr. Burkette, whose linguistic expertise helped deepen my knowledge of the science of language and exposed me to alternative theories of metaphor analysis. I am also deeply thankful for the financial and academic support of the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College, whose generous aid made the research for this thesis possible by allowing me to follow the 2012 French presidential campaign trail during my Study Abroad.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for their unabated encouragement throughout the research and writing of this thesis. In particular, I am appreciative of the love and support given by Rachel Knitzer, the muse without whom I would not have been able to write the pages that follow.

Abstract

This thesis examines the ways in which French national identity was constructed metaphorically during the 2012 presidential election. Due to the increased controversy surrounding the overt utilization of the term “national identity” following the 2007-2012 Sarkozy administration, candidates in the 2012 presidential election used metaphor as a means by which to define their own competing conceptions of French national identity. The goal of this study is to examine the phenomenon of national identity creation by addressing the following question: How does each principal candidate (François Hollande, Nicolas Sarkozy) in the French presidential election of 2012 use metaphor in order to construct their own vision of national identity?

This thesis employs a qualitative methodology that synthesizes cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis to systematically analyze the metaphorical enunciations of each candidate in eight major campaign discourses. It deconstructs and details a deliberate and coherent strategy to mold metaphor into a cohesive national narrative that supports each candidate’s respective ideology. The thesis concludes that not only did the candidates employ metaphor to address the complex and taboo nature of national identity, but also that political ideology does indeed influence metaphorical constructions of French national identity.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: The Soul of France: Origins and Components of French National Identity	6
Chapter 2: Metaphor, Identity, and Ideology: Redefining Political Reality	23
Chapter 3: Blazing the Campaign Trail: Metaphorical and Ideological Differences between François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy	34
Conclusion	71
Bibliography	75

INTRODUCTION

En juillet 2007, le conseiller de Nicolas Sarkozy, Henri Guaino, résumait ainsi, dans un entretien au Monde, sa contribution à la campagne présidentielle : “La politique c’est écrire une histoire partagée par ceux qui la font et ceux à qui elle est destinée. On ne transforme pas un pays sans être capable d’écrire et de raconter une histoire.”¹

—Christian Salmon, *Storytelling: la machine à fabriquer des histoires et à formater les esprits*, p. 200

In a dimly-lit exposition hall² packed with thousands of French partisans, the distant figure of François Hollande appears suddenly, flanked by two towering projector screens blazing his determined visage to the roaring crowd as he thunders: “Every nation has a soul!” (17).³ The dramatic *mise en scène* of the opening line of Hollande’s official campaign video⁴ is immediately recognizable to anyone following the 2012 French presidential election—Hollande is pronouncing his first major political discourse of the campaign at the “Great Meeting” of Le Bourget on January 22, 2012, exactly three

¹ In July 2007, the special adviser to Nicolas Sarkozy, Henri Guaino, summarized thusly, in an interview with *Le Monde*, his contribution to the presidential campaign: “Politics is to write a story shared by those who make it and those to whom it is intended. One does not transform a country without being capable to write and to tell a story.”

² “Grande Salle” is the French term used to reference the large exposition halls where the majority of campaign rallies and speeches take place.

³ “Chaque nation a une âme!”

⁴ In accordance with French campaign law, each of the ten candidates running in the 2012 French presidential election presented video clips of 1 minute and 30 seconds. These videos were given equal air time on French television throughout the campaign. Official campaign clip of François Hollande: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HSu5JI0LF64>

months before the first round of the presidential election.⁵ As the camera zooms in to frame Hollande behind the speaker's podium, he continues: "The soul of France is equality" (17).⁶ Amid tumultuous cheers of affirmation, he launches into a stream of explanations, each detailing what France has done "for equality,"⁷ and each accompanied by flashed images from French history. For a few seconds we see a protester brandishing a hand-made sign with the Revolutionary motto "liberté, égalité, fraternité,"⁸ only to be replaced by *The Taking of the Bastille and the Arrest of M. de Launay*,⁹ a well-known painting depicting events of the French Revolution of 1789, it in turn supplanted by an image of the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man. Like a schoolmaster, Hollande continues to outline what France has done throughout its history in the name of equality. Next we see a portrait of Jules Ferry, father of "free, obligatory, secular public education" in 1881-1882,¹⁰ and influential lawmaker during the Third Republic. Then, while dramatic orchestral notes intertwine themselves with Hollande's intonations, we hear the story of the great progressive achievements of the early 20th century: the institution of the income tax in 1914, the protests of the Popular Front in 1936 that resulted in paid vacations for all workers,¹¹ and the creation of Social Security under General De Gaulle in 1945. Savior of France after the horrors of the Second World War, Charles De Gaulle, traditionally associated with the conservative party in France, appears in Hollande's campaign video in full military dress, while the socialist candidate vociferously credits

⁵ "Grand Meeting" refers to the large political rallies during which campaign discourses are delivered to immense crowds of partisan supporters.

⁶ "L'âme de la France, c'est l'égalité."

⁷ "pour l'égalité"

⁸ "liberty, equality, fraternity"

⁹ *La prise de la Bastille et arrestation de M. de Launay*

¹⁰ "l'école obligatoire, gratuite et laïque"

¹¹ "les congés payés"

him with the institution of Social Security.¹² Next, Hollande enters into the great political achievements of the French left during the modern era, underscoring the significance of the election of François Mitterrand, the first socialist president of the Fifth Republic in 1981,¹³ and the implementation of universal health insurance under the government of socialist Prime Minister Lionel Jospin in 1999.¹⁴

Suddenly, the barrage of images pauses and the screen is filled with the grave face of the socialist candidate. The tone of François Hollande shifts as he declares in a deeper, more serious voice: “What is at stake during this campaign, is France.”¹⁵ Then, a second montage commences, during which Hollande describes his country as being a France characterized by the values of: work, merit, effort, initiative, enterprise, diversity, security, justice, solidarity, and equality. Just as in the first half of the video clip, this list of qualifiers for France is also accompanied by a quick succession of images, each one succinctly illustrating the attributes above. However, Hollande accentuates two of these virtues in particular: justice and solidarity. These values are central to François Hollande’s presidential campaign and are elaborated using metaphor as the means by which to illustrate their importance. First, Hollande declares: “A France of justice, where money will be put back in its place, which is that of a servant and not a master.”¹⁶ Here

¹² The appropriation of traditional figures and symbols of the opposing party is a recurring theme throughout the 2012 campaign.

¹³ With the shared first name of “François,” it was typical for many of the French to see Hollande as the logical successor of the legacy of François Mitterrand.

¹⁴ “La couverture maladie universelle,” a supplement to Social Security accessible to low-income and unemployed residents of France.

¹⁵ “L’enjeu de cette campagne, c’est la France.”

¹⁶ “Une France de la justice, où l’argent sera remis à sa place, qui est celle d’un serviteur et non d’un maître.”

Hollande engages the metaphor Money Is A Person (Servant/Master),¹⁷ implying that under the current economic environment the French people are enslaved by the “Master” that is money, and that this relationship should be inverted so that money is returned to its “proper place.”¹⁸ Next, Hollande intones: “A France of solidarity, where none of her children will be left by the wayside.”¹⁹ In this metaphor, the Nation Is A Parent and the French People Are Children; in sum, France Is A Family. Hollande employs a commonly used metaphorical conception of nationality in order to create a sense of universal community that transcends sub-national divisions. Finally, Hollande’s official campaign clip ends with yet a third series of repetitions. Nearly shouting with righteous enthusiasm, the socialist candidate proclaims that four realities will arrive “now,” presumably under his presidency: recovery, justice, hope, and the Republic.²⁰ Hollande concludes by pronouncing his official campaign slogan: “Change is now!”²¹

François Hollande’s official campaign video is different than those of his opponents, the majority of which consist of a monologue delivered by the candidate. Unlike the other campaign clips, Hollande’s video communicates a National Narrative, artfully constructed and reinforced by means of metaphor. This narrative above all illustrates Hollande’s conception of French national identity and reveals that metaphor is his principal method for transmitting his vision to the public. Indeed, the synthesis of

¹⁷ This format for describing the base metaphor of an enunciation is derived from the formula used by George Lakoff in *Metaphors we live by*. Lakoff’s work will be studied in detail throughout the second chapter of this thesis.

¹⁸ Interestingly, the image of Bernard “Bernie” Madoff is used here to illustrate this metaphor in addition to evoking the financial crisis of 2008 in general.

¹⁹ “Une France de la solidarité, où aucun des enfants de la nation ne sera laissé de côté.”

²⁰ “Le redressement, c’est maintenant! La justice, c’est maintenant! L’espérance, c’est maintenant! La République, c’est maintenant!”

²¹ “Le changement, c’est maintenant!”

these two rhetorical strategies—metaphor and National Narrative—forms the foundation for the presidential campaign bids of socialist candidate François Hollande and UMP (*Union pour un Mouvement Populaire*) candidate Nicolas Sarkozy. The purpose of this thesis is thus to examine the role of these ideologically influenced metaphors in the definition of French national identity through the creation of National Narratives during the 2012 French presidential campaign.

In this study, I will examine the phenomenon of national identity creation by addressing the following question: How does each principal candidate (François Hollande, Nicolas Sarkozy) in the French presidential election of 2012 use metaphor in order to construct their own vision of national identity? This thesis is divided into three chapters, the first two of which extensively examine the theoretical concepts at the core of this research—National Identity and metaphor—and the third that synthesizes these concepts by means of discursive analysis. Chapter one covers the political context leading up to the 2012 presidential election, as well as the evolution in the definition of National Identity from the 19th century to the 21st. Chapter two reviews the academic literature surrounding metaphor and its function in political discourse. Finally, chapter three uses a qualitative methodology to examine a selection of political discourses from the 2012 French presidential campaign in a comprehensive analysis of the research question and hypothesis.

CHAPTER 1: The Soul of France: Origins and Components of French National Identity

...I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community...
 –Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, p. 5-6

After emerging victorious from the 2007 French presidential election, Nicolas Sarkozy established an unprecedented cabinet post within his executive council: the Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Solidarity Development. Not unintentionally, the juxtaposition of Immigration and National Identity within a single government ministry institutionalized one of the fundamental themes of Sarkozy's presidential campaign: the reshaping of the public's perception of National Identity to coincide with the more conservative vision of the *Union pour un Mouvement Populaire* (UMP), the party Sarkozy represents. In addition to the creation of a new cabinet position, Nicolas Sarkozy announced his intention to hold "a grand debate on National Identity,"²² together with the implementation of a series of concrete policy measures in order to "reinforce our national pact" (Landrin).²³ While the new government's emphasis upon debating and redefining National Identity was met with enthusiasm among partisans

²² "un grand débat sur l'identité nationale." See Valentine, *Eric Besson lance un grand débat sur l'identité nationale*.

²³ "renforcer notre pacte national"

of the UMP, the general public tended to view Sarkozy's novel initiatives as divisive measures designed to stigmatize minority groups, notably immigrants. Nicolas Sarkozy's broader project of giving prominence to the definition of National Identity and his dovetailing of this concept with issues of immigration marks a significant transformation in the relationship between citizenship and National Identity by emphasizing its exclusive and often divisive elements.

The formation of the new Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Solidarity Development was not without controversy. Eight researchers from the "National City of the History of Immigration" (CNHI) resigned from their posts,²⁴ citing their opposition to the inevitable banalizing of xenophobic speech, previously confined to the extreme-right, resulting from the creation of the new ministry. In an interview with French newspaper *Libération*, Gérard Noiriel, one of the eight researchers and author of *Immigration, anti-Semitism and racism in France (XIXth-XXth centuries)*²⁵ reminds readers of:

...Le rôle majeur des mots plus que des idées ou des arguments dans la construction des stéréotypes sur l'immigration. Ce label associant immigration et identité nationale charrie des représentations négatives. Désormais, tout le monde va prononcer quotidiennement le nom de ce ministère, et ce qui auparavant ne s'entendait que dans la bouche des gens d'extrême droite va être complètement banalisé.

...The major role of words more than ideas or arguments in the construction of stereotypes on immigration. This label associating immigration and National Identity carries negative representations. Henceforth, everyone is going to pronounce daily the name of this ministry, and what was before only heard

²⁴ "La Cité nationale de l'histoire de l'immigration" (CNHI). The decision to create the CNHI was made in 2002 following the unexpected presence of extreme-right wing candidate Jean-Marie Le Pen in the second tour of the presidential election. The principle objective of the CNHI is to "contribuer à changer le regard sur l'immigration" (contribute to change perspectives on immigration).

²⁵ *Immigration, antisémitisme et racisme en France (XIXe-XXe siècles)*

coming from the mouth of the extreme-right is going to become completely trivialized. (Coroller)

Noiriel observes that Sarkozy's formation of the Ministry of Immigration and National Identity is a deliberate shaping of the political discourse designed to normalize the discussion of national identity and immigration, a previously taboo intersection of controversial ideas often characterized by xenophobic or even racist discourse. Furthermore, the constitution of a new ministry only proved to be the first step in a series of official policies designed to address the vague concept of "National Identity."

In 2009, the "grand debate" was then placed under the aegis of Prime Minister François Fillon and the new Minister of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Solidarity Development, Eric Besson. According to Besson, the project would become "a great debate on the values of National Identity."²⁶ The official launch of the debate took place on November 2, 2009 and was centered on the question: "According to you, what is it to be French?"²⁷ This question was posted online via a government-sponsored website and the French were encouraged to participate in the debate during a period of roughly three months until its closure in February. In only one week, the website received over 185,000 visits. In total, 25,000 responses were received in answer to the posed question (Valentine, Grand débat sur l'identité nationale : Eric Besson salue l'engouement populaire et annonce de nouvelles évolutions du site Internet). In addition to the online component of the "grand debate," town hall meetings discussing this issue and related topics took place in municipalities across France, although public feedback often took the

²⁶ "un grand débat sur les valeurs de l'identité nationale"

²⁷ "pour vous, qu'est-ce qu'être Français?"

form of anti-immigrant and anti-Islamic commentaries and never resulted in concrete political action.

Then, on February 8, 2010 a governmental seminar chaired by Prime Minister François Fillon was held in Paris. Following this summit, a series of measures were taken in order to “reinforce the national pact.” These measures included the expansion of civic education, the display of the French flag and the declaration of the rights of man in every classroom, the signatory requirement of a “contract of rights and duties” in order to obtain French nationality and the increase of the French language level required for French citizenship.²⁸

With the adoption of these civic measures, the “debate” organized by President Sarkozy and Prime Minister Fillon continued to spark much controversy, further exacerbating the divide between the left-wing *Parti Socialiste* (PS) and the right-wing *Union pour un Mouvement Populaire* (UMP). According to the socialist opposition, the debate merely served to instigate racist sentiments surrounding increased immigration to France, particularly that of Muslim populations originating from North Africa. The leaders of the French left maintained that public opinion was on their side, as a CSA (Conseil, Sondage et Analyse) poll conducted the 16th and 17th of December revealed that a majority of French citizens (50%) were not in fact satisfied with the way in which the “grand debate” on National Identity was proceeding (Associated French Press).²⁹ In an interview with the Associated French Press on December 20, 2009 Martine Aubry, first secretary of the Socialist Party, declared that “in light of numerous missteps, we demand

²⁸ “charte des droits et des devoirs”

²⁹ (Advice, Polling, Analysis). 25% pronounced to be in favor of the debate, and 25% declined to give a response. Approximately 1000 people were polled via telephone over two days.

once more to finish with this debate, and for that matter to terminate the ministry of Immigration and National Identity, the existence of which shames our country” (Associated French Press).³⁰ Furthermore, Jean-Marc Ayrault, then president of the Socialist Group in the National Assembly and now the current Prime Minister, demanded on the 22nd of December that the debate on National Identity cease because it “gives a negative image of France” (Le Nouvel Observateur).³¹ According to the Socialists, the “debate” on National Identity and its close association with France’s immigration problems evidenced by the newly formed ministry only served to project a racist and xenophobic image of the French government both domestically and abroad, as the government was seen as questioning the “Frenchness” of immigrants to France. These widespread criticisms from the Socialist Party were soon repeated by the majority of the French left, with groups like SOS Racisme and the Parti de Gauche also speaking out against the debate on National Identity (Libération).³²

In addition to the universal condemnation from the political left and the general disapproval of the public for the debate on National Identity, several factions of the French right also broke rank and file with the Prime Minister and the new Minister for Immigration and National Identity. In an interview with *Le Parisien* on December 20, Alain Juppé, former UMP Prime Minister, commented that “The question ‘what is it to be French’ doesn’t need to be asked” (Le Parisien).³³ According to Juppé, the response to

³⁰ “devant les nombreux dérapages, nous demandons à nouveau d'en finir avec ce débat, comme d'ailleurs de supprimer le ministère de l'Immigration et de l'Identité nationale, dont l'existence même fait honte à notre pays.”

³¹ “donne une image négative de la France”

³² Harlem Désir, president of SOS Racisme between 1984 and 1992, became leader of the Socialist Party in 2012.

³³ “La question ‘qu’est-ce qu’être Français’ ne se pose pas vraiment.”

the question is already well known: “three words in total: liberty, equality, fraternity. Adding on *laïcité*, we have what is French identity.”³⁴ In a further blow to the new Minister of Immigration and National Identity, Juppé dedicated an entire post on his official blog to the “grand debate” on National Identity (Andriamanana). Juppé cited French philosopher Ernest Renan, who in 1882 defined the nation as “a spiritual principal, a spiritual family, not a group determined by the configuration of birthplace.”³⁵ The former Prime Minister then finally concluded, “All is said. What good is it to relaunch the debate?”³⁶

One of the consequences of the many adverse reactions to the French discussion on National Identity led by Nicolas Sarkozy’s new government was the growing hesitation by politicians and journalists to directly address the issue. The political discourse surrounding the definition of National Identity quickly grew to include the contentious matter of increased immigration to France from the Maghreb; consequently, the debate soon exploded to encompass a host of vitriolic interrogations on the role of Islam in France. As the political backlash became apparent not only among the ranks of the left-wing political parties, but also within Nicolas Sarkozy’s own right-wing camp, the taboo surrounding the open discussion of National Identity was reinforced. Widely regarded as a failure, the “great debate” on National Identity in 2007 ultimately stigmatized further discussion of issues relating to immigration and citizenship.

³⁴ “trois mots ... d’une actualité totale : liberté, égalité, fraternité. Ajoutons-y la *laïcité*, et on a l’identité française.” One should note that *laïcité* is the French concept denoting the absence of government involvement in religious affairs and vice versa.

³⁵ “un principe spirituel, une famille spirituelle, non un groupe déterminé par la configuration du sol”

³⁶ “Tout est dit. À quoi bon relancer un débat?”

President Sarkozy's emphasis upon National Identity and the importance of its definition was a significant characteristic of his early presidency and should have continued to play an important role during the following presidential campaign and election of 2012. However, after the "failure" of the "grand debate," the question of a definition of National Identity largely disappeared from the French press and was hardly ever overtly referenced by either of the two principal candidates during the presidential campaign of 2012.

The discursive shift away from questions of National Identity observed both within the political sphere and the media is significant due to the intentional abandon of a considerably useful talking point. In essence, the evocation of National Identity by politicians remains a powerful discursive tool because of its capacity to link the largest possible number of voters amongst an electorate into an imagined community, whose definition they can attempt to determine.³⁷ Nevertheless, agreeing upon a definition of National Identity as both an abstract concept and with respect to specific nations is remarkably varied and usually ambiguous. Two questions are thus indispensable to this research: What is National Identity? What are the origins and specificities of this notion in France? In order to answer these complex questions, the next section of this chapter will bridge the gap between the present use of the term "National Identity" and its historical roots in French political thought in order to draw a synthetic definition that will be used throughout the course of this thesis.

Researcher Gérard Noiriel uses a socio-historical approach in order to scrutinize Nicolas Sarkozy's demonstrable emphasis upon "National Identity. Noiriel's book *What*

³⁷ The concept of "imagined communities" as it relates to National Identity is described in detail by Benedict Anderson in his foundational book *Imagined Communities*.

*Good is “National Identity”*³⁸ is a discursive analysis of several key speeches made by the UMP candidate during the 2007 presidential campaign. Most significantly, Noiriél chronicles the evolution of the ideas that became “National Identity.” Prior to the 1980s, the term itself was not in use; instead, the nation was metaphorically construed as a human being, and such expressions as “personality, national character, soul” were used in political speech to denote National Identity.³⁹ Noiriél relies upon historical descriptions of National Identity as given by French thinkers such as historian Jules Michelet⁴⁰ and Ernest Renan.⁴¹ Noiriél also notes the first social definition of “National Identity” by geographer Vidal de la Blache, who advanced the idea of a national French race whose historically rooted presence in the countryside ensured the continuity and transmission of French National Identity.

Noiriél chronicles the utilisation of the term “National Identity” during the presidential campaign of 2007 and demonstrates how Nicolas Sarkozy’s particular use of the term is an extension of traditional right-wing discourse on the subject. Relying again upon Michelet, Renan, and de la Blache, Noiriél concludes that the traditional conception of National Identity for the right includes a sense of “territorial roots,”⁴² while that of the

³⁸ *À Quoi Sert “L’identité nationale”*

³⁹ “personnalité, caractère national, âme”

⁴⁰ French historian Jules Michelet penned the celebrated *Histoire de France* and was one of the first academics to characterize France as a person. According to Michelet, “L’Angleterre est un empire, l’Allemagne un pays, une race; la France est une personne” (England is an empire, Germany a country, a race; France is a person).

⁴¹ In 1882, Ernest Renan delivered at the Sorbonne his famous lecture entitled *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?* (What is a nation?) Renan was cited previously by Alain Juppé.

⁴² “l’enracinement dans le terroir.” After starting his career as a proponent of individualism, Maurice Barrès, soon to become the leading intellectual of the French reactionary right, went through a radical philosophical change of which *Les Déracinés* (*The Uprooted*) was the first example. In this influential novel, Barrès posits that one is deeply connected to his region of origin (or *terroir* in French) and that the education of

left emphasizes “republican values.”⁴³ After exposing the traditional right-left wing cleavages concerning the definition of National Identity, Noiriel explains the synthetic strategy of Sarkozy as proposing a “reconciliation” of the two traditional definitions. In order to reconcile the two conceptions of National Identity, Sarkozy made the republican principle of “integration” a fundamental criterion of historical continuity. In other words, according to Sarkozy, the values of the republic have always existed and thus should continue to be maintained. In a political *coup de grâce*, Nicolas Sarkozy then discursively provided throughout the 2007 presidential campaign his own definitions of “republican values,” most of which largely rely upon their opposition to a “foreign menace” of adverse value systems. With this novel synthesis of republican values and the anchored heritage of French identity into a newfound emphasis upon the integration of immigrants, Nicolas Sarkozy therefore marks the most current stage in the evolution of the concept of French National Identity.

With regards to the examination of National Identity with respect to its conception and evolution in France, French philosopher Ernest Renan’s 1882 lecture entitled *What is a nation?* is seen as a cornerstone.⁴⁴ Here Renan provides a preliminary definition of the nation:

La nation, comme l’individu, est l’aboutissant d’un long passé d’efforts, de sacrifices et de dévouements. Le culte des ancêtres est de tous le plus légitime; les ancêtres nous ont fait ce que nous sommes. Un passé héroïque, des grands hommes, de la gloire (j’entends de la véritable), voilà le capital social sur lequel on assied une idée nationale. Avoir des gloires communes dans le passé, une

the masses under the Third Republic uprooted many young men by attracting them to Paris from their birthplace, thus leaving them without any real connection to French soil and leading them to become a lost generation for the country. One can see how important this idea became for French nationalism.

⁴³ “les valeurs républicaines”

⁴⁴ *Qu’est qu’une nation?*

volonté commune dans le présent; avoir fait de grandes choses ensemble, vouloir en faire encore, voilà les conditions essentielles pour être un peuple.

The nation, like the individual, is the end result of a long past of efforts, sacrifices and commitments. Thus the cult of ancestors is more legitimate; our ancestors have made us who we are. A heroic past, great men, real glory, this is the social capital on which we place the national idea. To have common glories in the past, a common will in the present; to have done great things together, to want to do these things in the present, these are the essential conditions in order to be a people. (1-13)

Although Renan addresses the practical foundations of the nation throughout his lecture, he emphasizes a more metaphorical conception of National Identity. Renan acknowledges, “The community of interests is assuredly a powerful link between men” (9).⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the French philosopher does not believe that such pragmatic motivations suffice for the creation of a National Identity. He thus continues, “There is in nationality a sentimental side; it is simultaneously soul and body” (9).⁴⁶ Next Renan synthesizes his definition of the nation with the spiritual appellation of “soul” that he uses as a descriptor for National Identity. According to Renan, there are two integral components to the “soul” of a nation: the first rests anchored firmly in the past, in the collective remembrance of a common legacy rich in memory; the second is realized in the present desire of a group of people to live together and to continue to value their common heritage. Finally, Renan, in a typical Cartesian fashion, reinforces the body/soul metaphor of National Identity by equating the nation with the individual. Renan concludes: “The

⁴⁵ “La communauté des intérêts est assurément un lien puissant entre les hommes.”

⁴⁶ “Il y a dans la nationalité un côté de sentiment; elle est âme et corps à la fois.”

existence of a nation is a daily plebiscite, as the existence of an individual is a perpetual affirmation of life” (10).⁴⁷

The initial examinations of Ernest Renan form the foundation for modern investigations into the conceptual transformation of National Identity over time. Building upon Renan’s ideas, Anne-Marie Thiesse furthers the importance of memory⁴⁸ in developing the idea of a “collective conscious” composed of a common language, history, landscape, historical monuments,⁴⁹ and folklore. In her essay entitled *Creative Fictions: National Identities*,⁵⁰ Thiesse defines the most important part of what constitutes a nation as “the transmission of a collective and inalienable heritage across the ages” (52).⁵¹ With regard to the formation and evolution of National Identity, Thiesse emphasizes the ongoing pursuit of a society to understand and recognize new collective references to their own National Identity. According to Thiesse, this task is accomplished by means of fictional representations, especially national myths.

Thiesse further elaborates upon the particularities of French conceptions of National Identity in her book *Making the French: What national identity?*⁵² She asserts that National Identity is often represented through the metaphor of a family, thus allowing French National Identity to be imagined as both a fluid and stable construct—

⁴⁷ “L’existence d’une nation est un plébiscite de tous les jours, comme l’existence de l’individu est une affirmation perpétuelle de vie.”

⁴⁸ Jean-Jacques Courtine further elaborates upon the subject of memory in his paper “Le Tissu de la Mémoire: Quelques Perspectives de Travail Historique dans les Sciences du Langage.”

⁴⁹ In a groundbreaking, seven-volume work entitled *Les Lieux de Mémoire (Places of History)*, Pierre Nora details the relationship between history, memory, and national identity.

⁵⁰ *Des fictions créatrices: les identités nationales*

⁵¹ “la transmission à travers les âges d’un héritage collectif et inaliénable”

⁵² *Faire les français: Quelle identité nationale?*

much in the way that a family rooted in its ancestral past is still capable of redefining itself through its present actions. Throughout her work, Thiesse underlines the link between a shared past and a common National Identity, effectively reaffirming the initial observations of Ernest Renan. Furthermore, she contends that there are multiple, sometimes competing versions of National Identity, all of which vary according to ideological affiliation. Thiesse observes: “When the future is uncertain, conflicts for the determination of the past intensify” (49).⁵³ This commentary on the ever-evolving struggle for the (re)definition of National Identity neatly dovetails with the conclusions of Gérard Noiriel and validates the latter’s investigation of Nicolas Sarkozy’s strategic appropriation of the concept during the 2007 presidential campaign and the socialists’ reluctance to participate in the resulting national discussion. Ultimately, National Identity is a multidimensional concept that encompasses various definitions from the fields of sociology, philosophy, and political science.⁵⁴ However, three dimensions of the concept of National Identity are particularly salient in relation to this thesis: national mythology, race and ethnicity, geography and language.

According to Thiesse, the notion of national mythology, or “national narrative,”⁵⁵ encompasses numerous dimensions of National Identity. At the most basic level, national mythologies exist as a means by which to construct and maintain an *imagined community*. According to Benedict Anderson, nations are an imagined community because members of nations never come in contact with the majority of their fellow-

⁵³ “Quand le futur est en panne, les conflits pour la détermination du passé se radicalisent.”

⁵⁴ In their paper *National Identity*, Stefan Spießberger and Marliese Ungersböck examine the many definitions of National Identity before examining its implications for international marketing, their particular field of study.

⁵⁵ “récit national”

members, yet camaraderie exists in the minds of each member. These fraternal bonds are the product of the cultural roots of nationalism and National Identity. Thiesse contends that nations constantly reaffirm the memory of these “cultural roots” in order to transmit their heritage across generations, and that the most effective method for accomplishing this task is the creation of national mythologies in order to engender recognition and understanding among the members of a national group.

The French-specific national mythologies that play a paramount role in the imagining of French National Identity share four salient features. First and foremost among these is the predominance of the French Revolution and the universal values inherited from the enlightenment from which it was inspired. The revolutionary motto of “liberté, égalité, fraternité” (to which Juppé obligingly added “laïcité”) holds an influential place in the collective perception of French history. Secondly, mentioning the institution of “the secular, public and free school” during the Third Republic evokes a set of republican “ideals” or “values” upon which the current Fifth Republic rests.⁵⁶ Thirdly, the establishment of the Fifth Republic in 1958 by Charles De Gaulle reconnected France with its Third Republic roots and provided a starting point from which to measure contemporary social and political progress. Finally, the ideological variations of National Identity engender differing versions of national mythologies across the French political spectrum—all of which however are critical elements of French National Identity as a whole. In essence, Thiesse’s conception of national mythology is the medium by which Ernest Renan’s “soul” of a nation is realized and is an integral part of modern expressions of National Identity.

⁵⁶ “l’école laïque, publique et gratuite.” The *Lois Ferry* established obligatory secular, public, free education in 1882.

The second principal component of National Identity is the notion of race and ethnicity. The racial elements latently present in modern conceptions of National Identity are subtler in nature than expressions of national mythology and are often surreptitiously linked with attitudes towards immigration. In *The Myth of National Identity*,⁵⁷ Régis Meyran studies this phenomenon in detail.⁵⁸ He traces the initial connection between race and National Identity back to a series of myths promulgated among the anthropological community of the nineteenth century that was at the time occasionally adopted by the general population:

Il y a le mythe de la guerre des deux races, Gaullois et Francs, et celui d'une race de paysans, dont la tradition était en harmonie avec le cosmos... Il y a aussi le mythe de l'antique pureté de la race française, qu'il faut restaurer parce qu'elle dégénère.

There is the myth of the war between two races, Gauls and Franks, and the race of peasants, whose tradition was in harmony with the cosmos... There is also the myth of the ancient purity of the French race, that is necessary to restore because it is degenerating. (11)

The problem with these mythological representations of race is ultimately one of affirmation by exclusion. In sum, racial constructions of French National Identity affirm themselves only by conceiving the French “race” in opposition to other groups. Meyran writes, “These mythological stories define in negative those who are not French: immigrants...” (11).⁵⁹ This racial dimension of French National Identity provides insight into the historical evolution of French identity while simultaneously underscoring a

⁵⁷ *Le mythe de l'identité nationale*

⁵⁸ *The Myth of National Identity*. In his book, Meyran conducts an “anthropologie historique de l'anthropologie” (historical anthropology of anthropology), in which he studies the transformations of the racial myths diffused among the community of French folklorists and anthropologists that are then relayed by politicians.

⁵⁹ “Ces récits mythiques définissent en négatif ceux qui ne sont pas des Français: les immigrés...”

nefarious predisposition to xenophobia should this component be solely maintained to the exclusion of all others.⁶⁰

Finally, the third dimension of French National Identity encompasses the relationship between geography and language. As alluded to by Meyran, there is evidence for a historical sense of peasant exceptionalism characterized by a perceived harmony with the land. This geographical contribution to the set of “cultural roots” that influence perceptions of French National Identity is also reaffirmed by Vidal de la Blache and Gérard Noiriel, both of whom over one hundred years apart recognized the importance of “territorial roots” in the steadfast transmission of French National Identity over time. Moreover, the idea of “territory” is closely associated with the French language, which gradually evolved out of a regional language to become the culturally dominant linguistic standard over the territorial boundaries of the French state. Due to its close relationship with geography and its function as the vehicle through which national myths are expressed, the French language is itself a fundamental aspect of French National Identity.⁶¹ In “The Fabric of Memory,”⁶² Jean-Jacques Courtine examines the relationship between history and identity as observed through language, specifically with regards to “social and collective memory, in its relationship to language and history”

⁶⁰ Even though anthropology as a discipline clearly rejected this concept it still lingers in the national discourse.

⁶¹ Throughout the Third Republic, regional languages were suppressed and replaced by French, an idea whose origin can be traced back at least as early as the French Revolution. As a matter of fact, France still has not signed the European Union Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, which is a perfect example of France’s very specific stance on regional languages.

⁶² “Le tissu de la mémoire”

(5).⁶³ Furthermore, other researchers have buttressed Courtine's theory by reiterating the link between language and collective memory and identity.⁶⁴

After examining key research related to the concept of National Identity, the term can thus be defined according to the following criteria: National Identity is an imaginary construct rooted in the desire to preserve and transmit to future generations a collective, historical memory of the past that comprises sociological, philosophical, and political aspects of the dimensions of national mythology, race, geography, and language. More precisely, French National Identity is metaphorically perceived as the "soul" of France, and is expressed through interconnected "national narratives"⁶⁵ that emphasize pivotal moments in the French collective consciousness: the universal values of the French Revolution, the Third Republic and the public school, Charles De Gaulle and the foundation of the Fifth Republic. Also important in the historical construction of French National Identity (in particular as it was envisioned by folklorists and anthropologists at the turn of the twentieth century) are a concept of an ancestor race that is closely tied to rural geography and an idealized mentality of the peasant class.⁶⁶ Even though contemporary anthropologists have debunked this fantasized facet of French national identity as lacking any kind of scientific basis, it was nevertheless constitutive of the national narrative. Finally, the French language plays an extremely important role in not only the definition of French National Identity, but also its expression, as it is the agent by which conceptions of National Identity are discursively formed and channeled. In the

⁶³ "La mémoire qui nous intéresse ici est la mémoire sociale, collective, dans son rapport au langage et à l'histoire."

⁶⁴ See Sériot, *Analyse du Discours Soviétique*.

⁶⁵ "récits nationaux"

⁶⁶ The history of the idea of an "ancestor race" of the Gauls and Franks is explored by Régis Meyran in *Le mythe de l'identité nationale*.

following chapter, the discursive construction of National Identity will be examined in detail.

CHAPTER 2: Metaphor, Identity, and Ideology: Redefining Political Reality

Most of what we understand in public discourse is not in the words themselves, but in the unconscious understanding that we bring to the words... We think in terms of systems of concepts, systems that fit together and make sense. In a discourse, our systems of concepts are used to make a sense of what is said overtly.

—George Lakoff, *The Political Mind*, p. 43

The complimentary relationship between national identity and political discourse encompasses the interrelated fields of linguistics and discourse analysis. In attempting to understand *how* the concept of national identity is conveyed in political discourse, researchers examine linguistic patterns employed by politicians when communicating their vision of national identity. Because of the intrinsic complexity of a concept such as national identity (especially in France, where presently the term is ambiguous if not taboo), politicians often attempt to describe it metaphorically. Furthermore, politicians of differing political ideologies use metaphor differently in order to redefine and construct their own interpretation of national identity.

Before adopting a multidisciplinary approach to conduct a corpus-based study in response to my research question “how does each principal candidate (François Hollande, Nicolas Sarkozy) in the French presidential election of 2012 use metaphor in order to construct their own vision of national identity,” I will first turn to previous literature in order to better understand the relationship between the two central concepts that comprise

the theoretical and methodological foundation of this thesis: national identity and metaphor.

Ruth Wodak integrates discourse and national identity in “The discursive construction of national identities.” Wodak’s research relies upon five foundational assumptions, all of which will also be considered in my research. Firstly, nations are conceived as mental constructs, or *imagined political communities*. Secondly, national identities are produced, reproduced, transformed and destructed *discursively*. Thirdly, national identity is a *habitus*, as described by Pierre Bourdieu. Thus, national identity can be described as “a complex of common ideas, concepts or perception schemes, (a) of related emotional attitudes intersubjectively shared within a specific group of persons; (b) as well as of similar behavioral dispositions; (c) all of which are internalized through ‘national’ socialization.” Fourth, Wodak states that the construction of national identity runs parallel with the “construction of difference/distinctiveness and uniqueness.” Finally, Wodak emphasizes the role of discursive context by assuming that “different identities are discursively constructed according to context, that is according to the social field, the situational setting of the discursive act and the topic being discussed” (153-154).

The preceding theoretical explorations of the relationship between discourse and national identity provide a solid foundation for the methodological approach detailed by Robert Crawshaw and Karin Tusting in their book *Exploring French Text Analysis: Interpretations of National Identity*. Crawshaw and Tusting present an overview of stylistics and Critical Discourse Analysis with the goal of providing the reader with several relevant approaches to analyzing written French, specifically in the context of

identifying and interpreting representations of national identity. Additionally, the researchers provide useful guidelines by which to situate a French text in its appropriate context and to consider various linguistic choices that reveal the deliberate intentions of specific authors at specific times. *Exploring French Text Analysis* also emphasizes the salience of fundamental groundwork on discourse analysis, specifically that of Michel Foucault and his ideas of intertextuality presented in *The Archeology of Knowledge*.⁶⁷ Finally, according to Crawshaw and Tusting, “a wider view of the ways in which discourse operates on collective consciousness can only be arrived at by looking at the minutiae of texts,” including structural aspects of style and linguistics (198). One such aspect—metaphor—will be closely examined in the following section.

The term *metaphor* encompasses many definitions that each express varying nuances according to its function in rhetoric, cognition, and discourse analysis. Etymologically, the word metaphor is derived from the Greek *metaphora* meaning “a transference,” especially of the sense of one word to a different word (Klein). According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, metaphor is “a figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them” (Merriam-Webster). The Concise Oxford English Dictionary defines metaphor as “a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to something to which it is not literally applicable” (Soanes and Stevenson). The above definitions share several common elements, first and foremost of which is the assertion that metaphor is above all a “figure of speech,” or a principally literary term. However, linguists who specialize in the cognitive aspects of language are challenging the notion

⁶⁷ *L'Archéologie du Savoir*

that metaphor is primarily a rhetorical device. According to George Lakoff, “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*). This explanation transcends the traditional rhetorical definition of metaphor; furthermore, the emphasis upon experiential importance underlines the value of metaphor in understanding complex cultural phenomena, such as national identity.

The intrinsic complexity and taboo nature of national identity demands a creative approach in order to facilitate its description and transmission. As such, in order to better understand the nature of metaphor itself, this research will rely upon the fundamental definitions of metaphor outlined by George Lakoff in *Metaphors we live by*.

George Lakoff and co-author Mark Johnson maintain in their book *Metaphors we live by* that metaphor is more than a rhetorical construct; rather, people think metaphorically and construct their perceptions of the world around fundamental metaphorical concepts. Lakoff and Johnson detail the systematicity of these concepts and illustrate through numerous examples the ubiquity of metaphorical thought in the English language. *Metaphors we live by* also provides the following description of metaphor: “Metaphors are not just words. They are concepts that can be and are often acted upon. As such, they define in significant part, what one takes as “reality” (Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*). For Lakoff, the explanatory function of metaphor is a powerful mental apparatus because “metaphor allows us to understand a relatively abstract and inherently unstructured subject matter in terms of a more concrete, or at least structured subject matter” (Lakoff, *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*). It is with respect to this critical function that George Lakoff’s definition of metaphor directly pertains to this

research, because metaphors are used by differing political ideologies to define a deeply ambiguous and relatively unstructured subject matter: national identity in the 2012 French presidential campaign.

As determined in the conclusion of the first chapter of this thesis, National Identity is deeply rooted in a nation's culture, or more importantly in the nation's perception of its own culture and language. Accordingly, there exists a significant relationship between the principal linguistic mechanism for expressing national identity—metaphor—and culture. Zoltán Kövecses investigates this phenomenon in: “Studying American Culture through its Metaphors: Dimensions of Variation and Frames of Experience.” In this study, Zoltán Kövecses uses “metaphoric frame analysis” to examine American culture. First, Kövecses observes, “languages vary because the experiences of people divided by these dimensions of experience [i.e. Social and cultural life] vary” (1). He then hypothesizes that because metaphors reveal and sometimes even constitute human experience, then metaphors should vary according to these social divisions. This concept of metaphor variation is particularly pertinent to the study of the use of metaphor by politicians, as I posit that metaphor use will vary not only according to social and other dimensions, but also and more importantly according to ideological divisions. Kövecses hints at this potential application of metaphor variation when he compares this notion with the concept of metaphoric frames of experience. According to Kövecses, “The usefulness of the former [i.e. metaphoric frames of experience] is in revealing distinct patterns of thought within American culture and society, whereas the main value of the latter is in reflecting alternative ways of seeing the ‘same thing’” (1).

According to Kövecses, metaphor can be described as the interaction between two cultural models—a source and a target domain, where the source provides much of the structure of the target (9). He thus maintains that there are cases in which some cultural frames are structured by other cultural models. Kövecses then systematically examines the ethnic, regional, subcultural, and individual dimensions of metaphor in American society through examples of dialogue and excerpts from American media sources. In short, “Studying American Culture through its Metaphors: Dimensions of Variation and Frames of Experience” magnifies the importance of metaphor by simultaneously revealing both its cultural and communicative significance.

In addition to understanding cultural experiences, metaphor also plays a paramount role in the understanding of political events. Anne-Marie Gingras provides an excellent introduction to the relationship between metaphor and political discourse in her article entitled “Metaphors in political language.”⁶⁸ Gingras asserts that political language actually incarnates political events. According to Gingras: “In effect, it is the discourses and images of political events, thus political language in a global sense, that find themselves at the heart of the experiences of the majority of the population, and not the events themselves” (159).⁶⁹ Similar to Lakoff and Johnson, Gingras recognizes the creative potential of metaphor when she claims that political language “...becomes in some way the ‘political reality’ for most citizens” (Gingras 160).⁷⁰ She also posits a pragmatic reason for the utilization of metaphorical expressions by politicians based upon

⁶⁸ “Les métaphores dans le langage politique”

⁶⁹ “En effet, ce sont les discours et les images sur les événements politiques, donc le langage politique au sens large, qui se trouvent au cœur des expériences de la majorité de la population, et non les événements eux-mêmes.”

⁷⁰ “...devient en quelque sorte la ‘réalité politique’ pour la plupart des citoyens et citoyennes”

the recognition that metaphor as a rhetorical device facilitates communication in general.

Gingras cites Frederic Bon, author of *Language and Politics*,⁷¹ who professed that metaphors describing politics render “render comprehensible and manipulable by common thoughts complex and abstract notions” (161).⁷²

“Metaphors in political language” specifically accentuates the important role of metaphor in political campaigns: “The significance of campaigns constructs itself, among other things, through its diverse language processes” (Gingras 162).⁷³ Finally, Gingras sums up her analysis of metaphors in political language with the following insightful statement:

Les métaphores, qui introduisent une dimension familière dans la description des événements politiques auxquels les citoyens et les citoyennes n’ont pas accès, pourraient sans doute être des clés de communication servant à attirer le lectorat vers une présentation plus analytique comprenant des mises en contexte historiques, juridiques, économiques, etc.

Metaphors, which introduce a familiar dimension to the description of political events to which citizens do not have access, could without a doubt be keys to communication serving to attract the audience towards a more analytic presentation including historical, juridical, and economic contextualizations, etc. (170)

In sum, “Metaphors in political language” reinforces the recognition that metaphor is particularly convenient in the direction of political campaigns. Most significantly, the power of metaphor to simplify complex concepts by framing them in more familiar contexts opens the door to an enlarging of the imagined national community, and thus the electorate.

⁷¹ *Langage et Politique*

⁷² “compréhensibles et manipulables par la pensée commune des notions complexes et abstraites”

⁷³ “La signification des campagnes se construit, entre autres choses, par les divers procédés langagiers.”

Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson provide a practical framework by which the utilization of metaphor can be directly applied to interpersonal communication in *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Relevance Theory recognizes that metaphor is an utterance of ostensive-inferential communication by which a speaker uses metaphor as an effective ostension in order to signal to an audience the relevance of the information that he is attempting to communicate.⁷⁴ Sperber and Wilson's work is further elaborated by Marinela Vramulet, whose paper entitled "Conditions of success for the metaphorical enunciation in the communicative exchange"⁷⁵ examines the function of metaphorical utterances in the context of a Mutual Cognitive Environment (MCE).⁷⁶ Vramulet argues that a larger MCE facilitates communication by enlarging the set of assumptions that are mutually manifest to both the speaker and the audience. After detailing the conditions by which a metaphorical utterance may succeed if the speaker and the audience share the same MCE, Vramulet asserts that metaphor, as an ostensive stimulus, has the highest capacity to attract the audience's attention. Furthermore, the utilisation of metaphorical utterances enlarges the MCE, thereby augmenting its own efficacy in what is essentially a positive feedback loop. Finally, metaphor is used ostensively in political discourse in order to increase the size of and reinforce the MCE shared between the speaker and his audience, thus ensuring the successful transmission of the politician's message.

⁷⁴ Sperber and Wilson recognize the importance of metaphor in ostensive-inferential communication but differ from Lakoff and Johnson with regards to how metaphor is cognitively processed. Please see Sperber and Wilson's article "A Deflationary Account of Metaphor" in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* for a more detailed presentation of Relevance Theory and cognition.

⁷⁵ "Conditions de réussite de l'énoncé métaphorique dans l'échange communicatif"

⁷⁶ The Mutual Cognitive Environment (MCE) is the physical environment shared by the speaker and the audience, together with their cognitive capacities, or ability to mutually recognize hypotheses that result from the shared environment.

Further elaborating upon the relationship between metaphor and politics, Francesca Rigotti addresses the relationship between political theory and political metaphor in *Political theory and its metaphors*.⁷⁷ Rigotti highlights the general consensus that "...metaphors play an important role, if not fundamental, in both political discourse theory and practice" (548).⁷⁸ In an observation that brings to mind the Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson, Rigotti remarks that metaphor in political discourse functions as a sort of "password" that invites the audience to enter into a common frame of reference (549). For Rigotti, although there are "archetypal" metaphors that are common across the spectrum of political language, metaphor can reveal an ideology or "political tendency."⁷⁹

George Lakoff examines in detail the idea that metaphor can explain political ideology in *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Lakoff uses cognitive linguistics to examine the metaphorical foundations for the moral systems upon which the two primary ideological positions in America are based. According to Lakoff, liberals and conservatives in America base their ideology upon two metaphorical systems that each rely upon different conceptions of "family." This connection with the idea of family is due to the overarching metaphor of The Nation Is A Family. He continues to relate family with morality, followed by an organized examination of the metaphors that support his theory. For example, Lakoff relies heavily upon economic metaphors used to describe morality, and their subsequent utilization by two contrasting models: the "strict father" model of conservatives and the "nurturing parent" model of liberals. These two models, firmly established in identifiable metaphors analyzed from a cognitive linguistics

⁷⁷ *La théorie politique et ses métaphores*

⁷⁸ "...les métaphores jouent un rôle important, pour ne pas dire fondamental, dans le discours politique théorique autant que pratique."

⁷⁹ "tendance politique"

perspective, are elaborated until they encompass the majority of the American political spectrum. Lakoff's cardinal conclusion is thus that political metaphors may be analyzed in order to elucidate differing ideologies.

Elena Semino further explores the ideological function of metaphor in *Metaphor in Discourse*. Concerning political discourse, Semino describes the relationship between discourse and ideology as dynamic: "discourses reflect particular ideologies, but also contribute to shape them and change them; ideologies result from discursal and social practices but also determine and constrain these practices" (90). This awareness of the mutual influence of discourse and ideology upon one another indicates that a candidate's ideology will not only influence the style and content of their political discourse as a whole, but also the structure and content of their metaphors designed to convey conceptions of French national identity.

This examination of the theoretical frameworks surrounding metaphor and its utilization in political discourse entails multiple conclusions. First and foremost, the historically dominant conception of French national identity as the "soul" of the imagined community that is the French nation is a cultural metaphor that lays the foundation for future metaphorical constructions of national identity. This initial metaphorical conceptualization of French national identity is extended throughout an evolving body of French "national narratives," essentially national myths intimately tied to the country's history and expressed through a medium that is itself an integral part of French national identity: the French language. Politicians effectively use the French language as a vehicle to convey metaphors that serve a dual purpose: to speak covertly about what has now become an often-taboo subject—national identity, and thus to indirectly redefine it

according to their own ideological preference. By using metaphor as not merely a rhetorical device, but as a creative tool to shape new political realities, French politicians actively attempt to attract the electorate into an enlarged cognitive environment designed to tap into the largest imagined community of them all: the French nation. The goal of this thesis is the identification of these metaphors and the analysis of their ideological specificities. In order to accomplish this task, the following chapter will outline a more concrete methodology based upon Semino's work.

CHAPTER 3: Blazing the Campaign Trail: Metaphorical and Ideological Differences between François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy

...le sens qui naît de tout acte de langage étant le résultat de la rencontre entre un sujet qui énonce et un sujet qui interprète, chacun en fonction de ce qu'il imagine de l'autre, on peut dire que l'identité de ces sujets n'est jamais que l'image coconstruite qui résulte de cette rencontre.⁸⁰

—Patrick Charaudeau, *Le discours politique: Les masques du pouvoir*, p. 5

In *Metaphor in Discourse*, Elena Semino presents a methodology for identifying metaphorical expressions based on the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) proposed by a group of scholars known as the Pragglejaz Group, of which she is a member. The MIP is as follows:

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

⁸⁰ ...the meaning born from all acts of language is really the result of the meeting between a subject that states and a subject that interprets, each one a function of what it imagines of the other, we can say that the identity of these subject is never anything but the coconstructed image that results from this meeting.

2. (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
 - More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
 - Related to bodily action;
 - More precise (as opposed to vague);
 - Historically older;

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

3. (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. (Semino 11)

At its essence, MIP emphasizes contextual analysis in order to determine the literalness of a word and therefore its possible metaphorical utilisation in discourse.

In addition to MIP as described by Semino, Rudolf Schmitt in “Systematic Metaphor Analysis as a Method of Qualitative Research,” outlines a qualitative approach to metaphor analysis based upon the theoretical work of Lakoff and Johnson. Schmitt begins with a review of the central concepts of cognitive linguistics, emphasizing the role of “body models.” Schmitt states that “as a rule metaphors transfer their image structure from straightforward and *gestalt*-like experiences to complex, taboo, or new subject matters” (366). It is the “source” or experience-based image that serves as a “model” for entire metaphorical schemes used to describe the world. In his paper, Schmitt also

devotes a section to “Culturally specific occurrences of metaphor” followed by the “Systematic analysis of a sub-group.” Here Schmitt relies upon Lakoff and Johnson’s definition of metaphor to form three conditions by which a word or phrase may be identified as metaphorical:

- a. A word or phrase, strictly speaking, can be understood beyond the literal meaning in the context; and
- b. the literal meaning stems from an area of sensoric or cultural experience (source area),
- c. which, however, is transferred to a second, often abstract, area (target area). (Schmitt 371)

For the purposes of this thesis, I will use a synthesis of Semino’s more delineated MIP and Schmitt’s more qualitative criteria in order to apply a methodology for metaphor analysis that is both methodical and descriptive. This methodology will be the theoretical foundation of the analytical portion of this thesis that has for its goal the systematic identification of metaphors relating to the definition or conception of national identity. The synthetic MIP will be the basis by which to test the hypothesis of this thesis, which is as follows:

Each candidate in the 2012 French presidential election used ideologically influenced metaphorical utterances in order to redefine national identity, thereby creating the largest possible Mutual Cognitive Environment within the French nation, thus attracting the largest potential electorate.

This thesis will also illustrate how each candidate constructs their metaphorical utterances by examining the discursive patterns that are present throughout their official discourses.

Discourse Selection and Organization

According to Michel Foucault, the term “discourse” includes a variety of media that serve as a means by which to constitute knowledge (Foucault, *L'Archéologie du Savoir*). Discourse is thus not only composed of the exchange of concepts in conversation, but also encompasses the dynamic of power that results from the control of information. In essence, those who have the social station that permits authoritative communication create and perpetuate discourse.⁸¹ Throughout the 2012 French presidential election, the two principal candidates, François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy, effectively controlled the dissemination and prioritization of information primarily by means of their lengthy political speeches. These written sources of political discourse will be the primary focus of the analytical portion of this thesis. Other sources of campaign discourse such as those from the French press will not be examined, simply because there are too many journalistic and other third-party sources to adequately analyze. Thus, for the purpose of this research, discourse analysis will be limited to official campaign documents. The campaign speeches chosen and presented in this thesis are representative in nature and have been selected as salient illustrations of metaphorical constructions of national identity.

The campaign discourses will be organized by “metaphorical themes.” Each metaphorical theme is simultaneously an overarching and recurring metaphor as well as an integral part of the “National Narrative” conceived by each candidate. These metaphorical themes also play a critical role in each candidate’s strategy of enlarging the

⁸¹ Besides *Les mots et les choses*, one can also refer to *L'ordre du discours* for his inaugural lectures at the Collège de France.

shared Mutual Cognitive Environment: in this case the encompassing concept of French national identity.

France Is A Person

One of the most widespread and fundamental political metaphors employed throughout the 2012 French presidential campaign was the conception that France Is A Person. How the French view France is an essential component of their national identity, and the multitude of attributes associated with personhood allow politicians to construct complex metaphors in order to frame their own vision of France.

In one of the earliest political assemblies of 2012, François Hollande delivered his first major speech of the presidential campaign in the Bourget on January 22 before a crowd of approximately 25,000 supporters and party officials. In his 90-minute long address, Hollande outlined not only his vision for political reform during the next five years, but also his personal conception of France. At the beginning of a passage that would soon become the core of his official campaign video clip, Hollande announced, “Each nation has a soul. The soul of France is equality.”⁸² By declaring that all nations have souls and that the soul of France is “equality,” François Hollande is applying the metaphor France Is A Person. The image evoked by imagining the country as a “person with a soul” echoes Ernest Renan’s aforementioned metaphorical conceptualization of France; moreover, similar metaphors are widespread throughout the French media and are typical of most descriptions of France found in public discourse. This fundamental metaphor, like the ones that follow, fits the conditions of the MIP and succeeds in

⁸² “Chaque nation a une âme. L’âme de la France, c’est l’égalité.”

transferring literal meaning from a sensoric and cultural source—in this case the human body and soul—to the more abstract notion of France and French national identity, and is the anchor to which additional human-related metaphors are linked.

Later in the same speech, Hollande evokes “A France of solidarity, where none of the children of the nation will be left by the wayside.”⁸³ The socialist candidate applies the same metaphor of France Is A Person, but this time emphasizes the physical aspect of personhood, rather than the more intangible notion of “soul.” By completing this duality with a second, more concretely based metaphor, François Hollande is reminiscent of Ernest Renan, who maintained that “There is in nationality a sentimental side; it is simultaneously soul and body.”⁸⁴ Furthermore, this second metaphor is composed of multiple layers, as Hollande’s declaration implies the dual metaphors France Is A Parent and Citizens Are Children. These extensions of the root metaphor France Is A Person serve to reinforce the initial metaphorical utterance while simultaneously branching out to encompass even more culturally relatable concepts. Moreover, further defining the “person” of France as a mother who cares for her children allows the speaker to infuse the metaphor with specific emotions, effectively further humanizing his vision of France.

At Paris-Bercy, François Hollande continued to employ the metaphor France Is A Person together with its extensions, France Is A Parent and Citizens Are Children. First, speaking of the welfare state, Hollande affirmed: “I want a protector-State who forgets no one, who doesn’t abandon any of his/her children, who makes sure that everyone feels a

⁸³ “Une France de la solidarité, où aucun des enfants de la Nation ne sera laissé de côté.”

⁸⁴ “Il y a dans la nationalité un côté de sentiment; elle est âme et corps à la fois.”

part of the Republic.”⁸⁵ At the end of his speech, Hollande tweaks the Citizens Are Children metaphor in order to create a nuance linked to immigration: “We believe in the one and indivisible Republic, capable to recognize and welcome all of her children in their diversity.”⁸⁶ This subtle elaboration of a more fundamental metaphor becomes even more explicit during a later speech in Marseille, where Hollande insists: “I want all French people to live together,⁸⁷ whatever their origin, whatever the color of their skin, whatever their sensibility, or where they live. They are all children of the Republic...”⁸⁸ Hollande’s “children in their diversity”⁸⁹ includes not only more explicit references to national origin and skin color, but also more subtle inclusions of sensitive identifiers such as “sensibility”⁹⁰ and current residential location. The vagueness of the former term allows Hollande to potentially reference both religion and ideology. The latter phrase “where they live”⁹¹ also includes two possible references: to those citizens who reside in France’s overseas Departments or Territories⁹² or those citizens who live in the

⁸⁵ “Je veux un État protecteur, qui n’oublie personne, qui n’abandonne aucun de ses enfants, qui fasse en sorte que chacune et chacun se sente pleinement dans la République.”

⁸⁶ “Nous croyons à la République une et indivisible, capable de reconnaître et d’accueillir tous ses enfants dans leur diversité.”

⁸⁷ The expression “vivre ensemble,” or “to live together,” is also found as a nominal construction: “le vivre-ensemble”; the phenomenon of transforming verbal phrases into noun expressions is more easily accomplished in French than in English. The notion of “vivre ensemble” is heavily associated with immigration and is a politically charged expression.

⁸⁸ “Je veux faire vivre ensemble tous les Français, quelle que soit leur origine, quelle que soit leur couleur de peau, quelle que soit leur sensibilité, où qu’ils habitent. Ils sont les enfants de la République...”

⁸⁹ “enfants dans leur diversité”

⁹⁰ According to LaRousse French Dictionary, “sensibilité” may include—in addition to “the aptitude of an organism to react to external or internal excitations”—“opinions, tendencies, and political party affiliation.”

⁹¹ “où qu’ils habitent”

⁹² *Départements d’outre-mer, territoires d’outre-mer*, or DOM-TOM

underprivileged zones of France's cities. In sum, Hollande's usage of the France Is A Person metaphor is typical of socialist ideology and tends to emphasize the welcoming and protective characteristics of a person, above all of a nurturing, parental figure.

Like François Hollande, Nicolas Sarkozy also employs the France Is A Person metaphor, albeit with ideologically influenced nuances that sometimes contrast with those of Hollande. For example, in his first major speech at Villepinte in Paris, Sarkozy speaks of a divided nation as capable of "feeling menaced" while simultaneously "wanting to conquer the world." Sarkozy is questioning France's place in Europe by evoking the division produced between those who want France to adopt a stronger role in the governance of the European Union and those who are fearful of a European Union that threatens the country's autonomy. These two dimensions of France may be unified if the nation's "children" recognize the value of work and its potential as a "means of emancipation."⁹³ According to Sarkozy:

Voilà comment je veux réconcilier la France *qui se sent fragilisée, qui se sent menacée* d'être dépossédée de tout ce à quoi elle tient et la France qui veut répondre à l'appel du grand large, *qui veut conquérir le monde*. Ces deux France ne sont pas antinomiques.⁹⁴ Elles sont les deux moitiés d'une même nation. L'une ne peut pas vivre sans l'autre. *La France a besoin de tous ses enfants, de tous ses talents*. C'est la première tâche du président de la République que de savoir organiser la synthèse et la cohérence de ces deux France. La clé c'est la valeur du travail! C'est le travail de tous qui fait la force d'un pays.

This is how I want to reconcile the France who feels weakened, who feels threatened to be dispossessed of all she holds dear, and the France who wants to respond to the call at large, who wants to conquer the world. These two Frances are not antonymic. They are two parts of the same nation. One cannot live without the other. *France needs all her children, and all their talents*. The first task of the president of the Republic is to know how to organize the synthesis and the

⁹³ "Le travail, c'est le socle. Le travail, ce n'est pas une fin en soi. Le travail, c'est un moyen. C'est le moyen de l'émancipation." "Work is the base. Work is not an end in and of itself. Work is a means. It is the means of emancipation."

⁹⁴ No American presidential candidate would use "antonymous" in a speech.

coherence of these two Frances. The key is the value of work! It is the work of all that makes the force of a country.⁹⁵ (11)

At Villepinte, Sarkozy characterizes France as a person who not only feels and acts, but who also has children—the French people, and above all those French people who recognize the value of work. Finally, in the conclusion of his speech, Sarkozy returns to the metaphor of France Is A Person Who Acts: “[France] ... who looks with confidence towards the future, who offers a future to each of her children, who invests, who invents, who creates, who does not have fear, who is audacious.”⁹⁶ France is not only a person; Sarkozy also implies that France Is An Entrepreneur. This metaphor reinforces his previous insistence upon the value of work, a value that is essential to a variety of “French values” that will later be explored as its own metaphorical theme.⁹⁷

At Bordeaux, Nicolas Sarkozy continued to employ metaphorical constructions in which France Is A Person Who Acts. In the opening paragraph of his discourse at Bordeaux, Sarkozy speaks of the Republic as a liberator who not only emancipates the French people, but also grants them rights and imposes duties. According to Sarkozy, “[It is] The Republic who makes us free women and men...The Republic gives each of us rights. But the Republic imposes upon each of us duties and responsibilities.”⁹⁸ With this

⁹⁵ There is an ambiguity in translating the French “qui” as either “who” or “which.” However, the gender-based nominal system in French tends to personify the country of France as feminine; I thus chose to use “who” instead of “which” in my translation.

⁹⁶ “[la France] ... qui regarde avec confiance vers le futur, qui offre un avenir à chacun de ses enfants, qui investit, qui invente, qui crée, qui n’a pas peur, qui a de l’audace.”

⁹⁷ François Hollande also makes use of the “value of work”; his metaphorical characterization of work and other values will be explored in the following section.

⁹⁸ “[C’est] La République qui fait de nous des femmes et des hommes libres...La République donne à chacun d’entre nous des droits. Mais la République impose à chacun d’entre nous des devoirs.” One should also note that the French word “devoirs” has a stronger connotation than its literal translation of “duties”; for this reason I translated “devoirs” as both “duties and responsibilities.”

particular construction of the metaphor France Is A Person Who Acts, Sarkozy evokes the image of a benevolent master, or even god, whose protection is not free. While this god-like image of France as a person seems to be rather conservative, in other speeches Sarkozy also utilizes a more personable construction of this same metaphor.

At the Place de la Concorde in Paris, Sarkozy exercises two very basic metaphorical constructions based upon the primary metaphor that France Is A Person. But first, in an overtly populous tone, Sarkozy evokes the history of the tragic Place de la Concorde and underlines its importance as not only a historically significant place, but also an idea: the hope for a better future.⁹⁹ Sarkozy equates this hope with the French “will to live together,”¹⁰⁰ a force that not only defines for Sarkozy what it is to be French, but is also the reflection of the power that mankind exercises over his own history. Sarkozy then launches the first metaphor: “You are France!”¹⁰¹ Here, the metaphorical idea of France as a person adopts a more individualized aspect: each member of the audience is a metonymic representation of France. Throughout the rest of the speech, however, Sarkozy implements the second metaphorical construction of “We the French.”¹⁰² Here, France is not simply each individual French person, but rather the collective “we” of the entire French nation. By using the second person plural form of “you,” Sarkozy initially omits himself from the national “group,” but then later includes himself in his definition of France by employing the first person plural “we.” By

⁹⁹ The “Place de la Concorde” is the largest public square in Paris and is the site where Louis XVI, Marie-Antoinette and many others were guillotined during the excesses of the Reign of Terror. The contemporary name “Concorde” was chosen by the Directory (1795) in order to mark the reconciliation of the French people after the tragic executions that had previously taken place.

¹⁰⁰ “volonté de vivre ensemble”

¹⁰¹ “Vous êtes la France!”

¹⁰² “Nous les Français”

appropriating both individual and collective metaphorical constructions during his speech, Sarkozy profits from the duality of meaning that results from conceiving France in these two fashions, effectively allowing him to further enlarge and unify his audience.

It is at Marseille that Nicolas Sarkozy employs numerous variations of the metaphor France Is A Person in order to further personalize his image of France and establish a closer connection with his audience and the electorate as a whole. He begins with a reminiscence that forms the construction of France Is A Parent:

Je n'ai cessé en avançant dans la vie de ressentir à quel point cette idée de France,¹⁰³ qui me semblait si éloignée de mon existence quotidienne lorsque j'étais jeune, y était en réalité présente à chaque instant, *combien la France était humaine, combien la France était charnelle et combien la France avait contribué à me façonner depuis l'enfance.*

I have not ceased in advancing through life to feel at what point this idea of France, that seemed to me so distanced from my daily existence when I was young, was in reality present at each instant, *how much France was human, how much France was voluptuous and how much France had contributed to fashion me since my infancy.* (2)

Here, France is human—even carnal—and has “fashioned” Sarkozy throughout his life. Sarkozy’s language is simultaneously sensual and maternal, and immediately conjures an image of Marianne, feminine symbol of the Republic and its values. The visage of Marianne holds an elevated status within the French Republic; her bust is prominently displayed in every town hall and court of law, her profile is featured on the official seal and logo of the government, and she is often featured on postal stamps and currency. In “A Muse for the Masses” David Pomfret writes:

The female body had been identified in the nineteenth century as an ideal visual representation of the nation as a “natural” unity. [...] In the late eighteenth and

¹⁰³ In the opening line of his memoir, *Mémoires de Guerre*, Charles De Gaulle wrote: “J’ai toujours eu une certaine idée de la France.”

early nineteenth-century incarnations, Marianne had often taken on a youthful appearance. In the mid to late nineteenth century, however, she developed a more mature and maternal aspect. (12)

In Sarkozy's speech, however, Marianne is much more than a symbol of the Republic; she is both mistress and mother to the French people, and so must be respected, obeyed, and above all, loved. The President of France does not only speak of France as exclusively *his* parent, however. In the following passage, Sarkozy speaks of a lesson learned and reminds his audience that the country is *their* parent too: "Looking back on all those years I understood that the combat, the essential combat is the one that one leads for *the country that saw your birth...*"¹⁰⁴ Here again, a double metaphor is used: first, Sarkozy describes a country that can see, and thus France Is A Person; second, a country that witnessed the birth of its citizens, and thus France Is A Parent.

Towards the middle of his speech at Marseille, Nicolas Sarkozy further humanizes his metaphorical variations of France Is A Person. Notably, this is also one of the rare times when either candidate explicitly employs the word "identity." Similar to Hollande, Sarkozy also evokes Renan when he contests:

On oublie qu'une France sans agriculteurs, sans ouvriers, sans artisans, sans usines, sans ateliers, sans fermes, serait une France qui aurait perdu *une partie de son âme*, de sa culture et de *son identité* et que ce serait un France économiquement à la merci des autres.

One forgets that a France without farmers, without factory workers, without artisans, without factories, without workshops, without farms, would be a France who would have lost *a part of her soul*, of her culture and of *her identity* and that this would be a France economically at the mercy of others. (8)

¹⁰⁴ "En me retournant sur toutes ces années j'ai compris que le combat, le combat essentiel, c'est celui que l'on mène pour *le pays qui vous a vu naître...*"

Thus far, Sarkozy has forwarded the metaphors that France Is Human, France Is Carnal, France Is A Parent and France Has A Soul, all variations of the principal metaphor that France Is A Person. In the next section of his discourse, however, Sarkozy continues to speak of France with an increasingly intimate selection of metaphorical enunciations. First, he begins a series of statements with the metaphorical phrase “to love France,”¹⁰⁵ followed by his disapproval of certain proposed policies from his opponent, François Hollande. For example, Sarkozy states: “To love France is to refuse to accept the 35 hours (work week) that leaves so many French companies unable to resist the competition of foreign enterprises.”¹⁰⁶ Sarkozy talks of loving France like a person, insomuch that when one loves someone, one does not support what is not in the best interests of the beloved. Sarkozy continues the metaphor of France Is A Person That We Love with yet another series of similar statements that all begin with the metaphorical phrase “when one loves France.”¹⁰⁷ Most revealing, Sarkozy declares: “When one loves France, one wants that France be mistress of her destiny and mistress of her home.”¹⁰⁸ The image called to mind is again of Marianne, mistress of the French people and synonymous with the French nation. In essence, Sarkozy uses the extended metaphor France Is Our Mistress to imply that France is a mistress who the French people should not abandon by supporting policies contrary to France’s best interest. Finally, Sarkozy concludes his discourse with three metaphorical enunciations, the first of which claims that France Is A Possession, the second that France Is A Person Whom We Love, and the

¹⁰⁵ “Aimer la France”

¹⁰⁶ “Aimer la France, c’est refuser d’accepter les 35 heures qui mettent tant d’entreprises françaises hors d’état d’affronter la concurrence des entreprises étrangères.”

¹⁰⁷ “Quand on aime la France”

¹⁰⁸ “Quand on aime la France, on veut que la France soit maîtresse de son destin et maîtresse chez elle.”

third that We Are France: “This country is ours. We love this country. We are all this country.”¹⁰⁹

Metaphorically characterizing France as a person permits politicians to humanize the abstract concept of the nation and to personalize their relationship with the French people. By choosing “person” figures that are characteristic of the family unit (parents, children, mistress), the overarching metaphor of France Is A Family is strengthened. Furthermore, the accessibility of universal family-figures featured in these metaphors allow a level of mutual comprehension between orator and audience that is greater than that found in other metaphorical constructions.

Values

Both François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy frequently enumerate the “values” they find fundamental in their understanding of France and what it means to be French. These specific values are based upon several key “republican values”¹¹⁰ that are touted as universal and are thus essential to understanding French national identity.¹¹¹ The most common of these “republican values” are found within the lofty ideals infused with the birth of the French Republic during the French Revolution: “liberty, equality, fraternity”¹¹² together with “*laïcité*.”¹¹³ These universal, republican values are the source from which more specific values are drawn. However, the two candidates subtly differ on

¹⁰⁹ “Ce pays c’est le nôtre. Ce pays nous l’aimons. Ce pays c’est nous tous.”

¹¹⁰ “valeurs républicaines”

¹¹¹ The attachment of the French to “republican values” is comparable to the American attachment to the constitution.

¹¹² “liberté, égalité, fraternité”

¹¹³ *laïcité* is the French concept denoting the absence of government involvement in religious affairs and vice versa.

two fronts: *which* particular values are the most important, and *how* that importance is metaphorically conveyed. In the campaign speeches of François Hollande, the most frequently recurring values are (in no particular order): equality, justice, education, work, solidarity, dignity, and laïcité. In Nicolas Sarkozy's speeches, the most persistent values are (in no particular order): work, effort, respect, politeness, courage, intelligence, solidarity, responsibility, authority, and liberty. These values are often juxtaposed with other core concepts associated with French national identity, such as language, culture, and history. To emphasize the eminence of these values, the two candidates often make use of diverse metaphors, the majority of which are rooted in the base metaphor Values Are Important Components/Structures.

In Marseille, François Hollande delivered a speech in which he defined the French Republic. According to Hollande: "The Republic is composed of values, principles, but the Republic is also a language, a superb language spoken throughout the world, loved by millions of people who read our literature" (7-8).¹¹⁴ The values referenced here by François Hollande do not single-handedly define the French Republic; rather, they are important components of the comprehensive idea that is the Republic. By using the metaphor Values Are Important Components, Hollande emphasizes the fundamental nature of French values as an instrumental constituent of the Republic while simultaneously contextualizing those values amongst other ingredients that combine to constitute National Identity. This same construction was also present in Hollande's discourse at the Bourget, in which he proclaimed: "But we belong to the same Nation,

¹¹⁴ "La République, ce sont des valeurs, des principes, mais la République c'est aussi une langue, une langue superbe parlée partout dans le monde, aimée de millions de personnes qui lisent notre littérature."

with her values, her principles, her culture, her language, her institutions and we therefore aspire to the same future” (1).¹¹⁵ Here, “Republic” is replaced with “Nation” but the metaphor does not change: Values Are Important Components (of the Nation) and therefore contribute to Hollande’s interpretation of French national identity.

In Orléans, Hollande applies the metaphor Values Are A Force. Speaking of the nature of the Republic, Hollande insists:

La République ce sont des institutions mais ce sont aussi *des valeurs qui nous permettent de vivre ensemble, qui nous élèvent les uns les autres*, quelle que soit notre condition, autour d’un même projet au service d’un intérêt général, au service d’une grande cause qui nous rassemble, nous réunit; la jeunesse, la génération qui vient, la capacité de donner à chacun l’espoir d’une vie meilleure.

The Republic is its institutions, but it is also *its values that permit us to live together, values that raise each and every one of us up*, regardless of our condition, around a common project serving the general interest, serving a great cause that gathers us together, reunites us; youth, the generation that is coming, the capacity to give to everyone the hope of a better life. (4)

Hollande continues:

Mais la République, quand on regarde ce qu’elle a permis depuis deux siècles, *c’est le mouvement qu’elle a imprimé par ses valeurs qui a fait avancer la France*. Car elle est exigeante, la République. Quand elle pose ‘Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité,’ il faut être à la hauteur. Il faut être capable de traduire ces principes et ces valeurs dans la réalité.

But the Republic, when we look at what she has made possible for two centuries, *is the movement that she has transmitted by her values that advance France*. Because she is demanding, the Republic. When she sets down ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,’ one must live up to them. One must be capable to translate these principles and these values into reality. (4)

Here Hollande speaks of values as forces that act upon the French people. In the first passage, he speaks of French values as a force at the individual level, allowing people to

¹¹⁵ “Mais nous appartenons à la même Nation, avec ses valeurs, ses principes, sa culture, sa langue, ses institutions et nous aspirons donc au même avenir.”

“rise up” and “live together.” This is above all a reference to “social advances”¹¹⁶ that have marked contemporary French history—and above all the history of the French Left—such as universal healthcare, worker’s rights and other social developments. Hollande is also affirming the importance of youth, a key aspect of his campaign that reminds successive generations of the inherited social gains that they must preserve at all costs. Also present in the above excerpt is another mention of “vivre ensemble,” here referencing the urban conflicts resulting from “communautarisme,”¹¹⁷ or

¹¹⁶ “les avancées sociales”

¹¹⁷ In French, “communautarisme” is a pejorative term that roughly corresponds to the same concept that Americans call “multiculturalism.” For many French, “communautarisme” is in direct opposition to the universalism inherited from the Enlightenment. According to the French dictionary *Larousse*, “communautarisme” is the: *Tendance du multiculturalisme américain qui met l'accent sur la fonction sociale des organisations communautaires (ethniques, religieuses, sexuelles, etc.)* [Trend of American multiculturalism that accentuates the social function of community organizations (ethnic, religious, sexual, etc.)]. According to the *Dictionnaire suisse de politique sociale*: “Le communautarisme, comme courant de pensée philosophique et de théorie sociale, se définit historiquement par la défense du bien commun et de sujets ancrés dans leur communauté. Né en Amérique du Nord, par réaction à La Théorie de la Justice développée par John Rawls au début des années 1970, qui assigne une priorité aux individus sur la communauté, le communautarisme privilégie la communauté à l'individu. En d'autres termes, les communautaristes, comme Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor, s'opposent à une conception de la société centrée sur l'individu abstrait et universel. Ils prônent, par contre, l'idée que l'intérêt communautaire peut être une valeur fondatrice de la société. Dans le domaine de la migration, la politique d'intégration, visant à valoriser les différences linguistiques, culturelles et ethniques des immigrés, repose sur le communautarisme. Les politiques de discrimination positive et de quotas, pratiquées plutôt dans les pays anglo-saxons, en sont les exemples les plus significatifs.” [Communautarisme, as a current of philosophical thought and of social theory, historically defines itself by the defense of the common good and of subjects anchored in their community. Born in North America, in reaction to the Theory of Justice developed by John Rawls towards the beginning of the 1970s, who assigned priority to individuals over the community, *communautarisme* privileged the community at the expense of the individual. In other terms, *communautaristes*, such as Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor, opposed themselves to a conception of society centered on the universal and abstract individual. They advocate, on the other hand, the idea that the communal interest can be a foundational value in society. In the domain of migration, the policy of integration,

communitarianism, the communal ties that bind immigrant communities and hinder broader ties to French society as a whole. According to Hollande, shared French values, if adopted by everyone, are the means by which to ameliorate this complex social problem. In the second excerpt, however, Hollande emphasizes the wider impact of the force of French values by asserting that French values advance the country throughout its history. Moreover, Hollande makes a connection between the values elaborated upon in his discourse and the fundamental “Republican values” of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. The socialist candidate is implying that by staying true to France’s long-held values, history may continue to progress and contemporary obstacles may be surmounted. However, it is important to recognize that the “French values” or “Republican values” in question are those as defined by Hollande, and thus emphasize the more socialist aspects of French history, culture, and ideals.

Like Hollande, Nicolas Sarkozy also makes use of the fundamental metaphor Values Are Important Components/Structures. However, the structure of Sarkozy’s metaphors concerning French values differs from that of his Socialist challenger. In particular, Nicolas Sarkozy consistently uses the variant metaphor Values Are Foundations Of France. For example, in Bordeaux the UMP candidate addresses the system of education in France, and the role of French values in a person’s formation: “It is with these values that we can one day construct the life of a man!” (3).¹¹⁸ Here there are two principle metaphors: Life Is A Construction and Values Are Building Blocks For Life. Sarkozy is affirming the importance of French values on the individual level; next

aiming to enhance the status of linguistic, cultural and ethnic differences of immigrants, rests on *communautarisme*.]

¹¹⁸ “...Ce sont avec ces valeurs-là que l’on peut un jour construire sa vie d’homme!”

he will modify these two metaphors into France Is A Construction¹¹⁹ and Values Are Building Blocks For France. At Marseille, Sarkozy reminds his audience, “For five years France has leaned upon her values, upon her institutions to stay strong” (6).¹²⁰ For Sarkozy, French values have contributed to the long-term strength of the country; moreover, these values are the foundation upon which France rests. Sarkozy firmly insists: “No compromise with Republican values!” (11).¹²¹

Among the many values that each candidate enumerates as being an essential component of “French values,” one distinguishes itself as particularly salient to the campaign and illustrates some of the fundamental ideological differences between the two candidates: the value of work. François Hollande succinctly defines his vision of the value of work in Marseille:

Mais l’espoir, l’espoir que je veux donner, la confiance que je veux rendre aux français, c’est aussi l’emploi, *le travail, qui est une valeur*, mais dès lors *qu’elle est partagée par tous*, que chacun puisse accéder, enfin, à la dignité qui est représentée par une activité, un travail, un emploi, un salaire, un revenu et la capacité de vivre sa vie.

But the hope, the hope that I want to give, the confidence that I want to give to the French people, this hope is employment, *and work, which is a value*, but *when it is shared by all*, when every one can access, finally, the dignity that is represented by an activity, a work, an employ, a salary, a revenue and the capacity to live one’s life. (5-6)

Notably, François Hollande not only defines work as a value, but also applies the qualifier that all share it. The universal right to work is further affirmed in other speeches, most notably at Orléans when Hollande proclaims: “My conception of the Republic is that it is a gathering, a reunion, a reconciliation, work for all, when citizens want to give

¹¹⁹ This metaphor will be closely examined in a later section of this chapter.

¹²⁰ “Pendant cinq ans la France s’est appuyée sur ces valeurs, sur ces institutions pour rester forte.”

¹²¹ “Pas de compromis avec les valeurs républicaines!”

themselves in service to the Nation” (5).¹²² Finally, Hollande directly affirms his esteem for the value of work just before Labor Day¹²³ at Bercy in Paris: “The value of work is a value within the Republic” (8).¹²⁴ This socialist ideal of “employment for everyone” is explicitly stated and rests implicit behind Hollande’s other metaphors concerning “value” and the “value of work.” For example, Hollande applies the situational metaphor France Is Divided In Confrontation in order to illustrate the divisive views of his opponent while simultaneously implying that his own conception of “work” is unifying in nature: “There is not a confrontation between two parts of the nation. There is not on one side the true French people and on the other side the false ones; *the true workers and on the other side the false ones...*”¹²⁵ *No, there is only one France...!*” (7).¹²⁶ Thus Hollande’s attack on his opponent’s position on the value of work is executed not by restating his own socialist comprehension of universal employment, but rather by implementing a metaphor that casts himself as a unifier and his opponent as divisive.

Nicolas Sarkozy, however, uses metaphor to convey exactly the same message albeit reversed in his favor. At Villepinte, Sarkozy forwards a variety of metaphors stemming from the root metaphor Work Is A Solution to solve the problem of France Is Weakened and France Is Divided. Sarkozy explains:

¹²² “Ma conception de la République, c’est le rassemblement, c’est la réunion, c’est la réconciliation, *c’est le travail pour tous*, dès lors que le citoyen veut se mettre au service de la Nation.”

¹²³ la fête du travail

¹²⁴ “La valeur du travail, c’est une valeur dans la République.”

¹²⁵ Here Hollande is evoking the terms “true” and “false” French people as framed by the debates surrounding immigration. He then extends the juxtaposition to include “true” and “false” workers, referencing those who work in the private sector as opposed to those who work as public “fonctionnaires.”

¹²⁶ “Il n’y a pas une confrontation entre deux parties de la nation. Il n’y aurait pas d’un côté les vrais français et de l’autre côté les faux ; *les vrais travailleurs et de l’autre côté les faux...Non, il n’y a qu’une France...!*”

Voilà comment *je veux réconcilier la France qui se sent fragilisée...et la France qui veut répondre à l'appel du grand large, qui veut conquérir le monde. Ces deux France ne sont pas antinomiques. Elles sont les deux moitiés d'une même nation...C'est la première tâche du président de la République que de savoir organiser la synthèse et la cohérence de ces deux France. La clé c'est la valeur du travail!*

This is how *I want to reconcile the France who feels weakened...and the France who wants to respond to the call at large, who wants to conquer the world. These two Frances are not antonymic. They are two parts of the same nation...The first task of the president of the Republic is to know how to organize the synthesis and the coherence of these two Frances. The key is the value of work!* (11).

Like Hollande, Sarkozy is also stating that the solution to a divided France is the recognition of the value of work. However, Sarkozy continues to advance a series of metaphors that specify his particular interpretation of the value of work. First, Sarkozy affirms the fundamental importance of work by declaring, “work is the bedrock.”¹²⁷ Then he elaborates: “Work is a means. It is the means of emancipation.”¹²⁸ The meaning of “emancipation” is then extended to equality when Sarkozy acknowledges: “Equality before work, before employment, is the foundation of real equality.”¹²⁹ Thus the succession of Sarkozy’s metaphors is as follows: Work Is A Bedrock, Work Is The Means (of emancipation), Work Is The Foundation (of equality). Finally, Sarkozy delivers his *coup de grâce* that opposes his theory of work to that of Hollande’s: “It is work that creates work. By sharing work, one destroys it. The 35-hour workweek did not create jobs, it undermined the value of work in the heart and spirit of the French people.”¹³⁰ This is Sarkozy’s qualifier—his answer to Hollande’s assertion that work

¹²⁷ “Le travail, c’est le socle.”

¹²⁸ “Le travail, c’est un moyen. C’est le moyen de l’émancipation.”

¹²⁹ “L’égalité devant le travail, devant l’emploi, c’est le fondement de l’égalité réelle.”

¹³⁰ “C’est le travail qui crée le travail. En le partageant, on le détruit. Les 35 heures n’ont pas créé des emplois, elles ont sapé la valeur du travail dans le cœur et l’esprit des Français.”

must be shared by all in order for the value of work engender equality. In contrast with the socialist candidate, Sarkozy claims that sharing work actually destroys its value. To support his claim, Sarkozy cites the 35-hour workweek as a negative influence upon the value of work. The 35-hour workweek, passed in 1998 by the socialist-controlled parliament,¹³¹ limited the maximum number of hours an employee could work, and thus was supposed to encourage employers to hire more workers in order to increase output. For Sarkozy, this policy constrains opportunities to hire, divides the nation, and is antithetical to his ideological conception of the value of work.

In conclusion, both candidates recognize the fundamental nature of “values” within the context of the French Republic and nation. Both candidates often make use of the same root metaphor Values Are Important Components/Structures. However, the metaphors used by each candidate vary in terms of style, emphasis, and specificity, as evidenced by their differing interpretations of the value of work. This particular example illustrates the fundamental ideological difference between Hollande’s socialism and Sarkozy’s liberalism. For Sarkozy, the value of work is the foundation for equality—only by first working and recognizing its value can French people liberate themselves and become equal. In order to illustrate its fundamental nature, Sarkozy metaphorically describes work as the base or foundation of a statue. For Hollande, however, the logic is inverted: the value of equality is integral to the Republic and thus demands equality *of* work, or universal employment. Hollande’s metaphor thus describes the Republic as a reunion or a gathering, where work is an inclusive value that is shared. The individual vs. collective emphasis of each candidate is clearly evident in these select metaphors and

¹³¹ Martine Aubry played an important role in this legislative initiative; she later became the First Secretary of the Socialist Party during the 2012 presidential election.

they continue to reappear in metaphorical enunciations throughout the course of the campaign.

France Is A Project

Conceptualizing France, the Republic, or the French people as a continual “project” serves to create a sense of camaraderie around the ongoing work in progress that both enlarges and reinforces the imagined French national community. Both François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy use the base metaphor France/The Republic Is A Project throughout the 2012 presidential campaign. Interestingly, each candidate tended to consistently employ his own specific variation of the base metaphor, effectively maintaining a unique sense of consistency throughout the presidential race.

Nicolas Sarkozy succinctly advances his own version of the French project by commencing his speech in Bordeaux with the fundamental metaphor: “The Republic, it is a project” (2).¹³² In other speeches, he elaborates upon this equivalence by incorporating it into his campaign slogan, “a strong France.”¹³³ At Villepinte in Paris, Sarkozy closes his discourse with a plea for help in the realization of the French project: “Help me construct the strong France, who fights to change the world, to change Europe, who fights for her values, who fights for her ideals” (14).¹³⁴ Sarkozy invokes a sense of national cooperation by inviting the French people to join him in constructing a strong country, effectually establishing the metaphor France Is A Construction. The former French president further extends this metaphor in Marseille, where he logically combines

¹³² “La République, c’est un projet.”

¹³³ “La France forte”

¹³⁴ “Aidez-moi à construire la France forte, qui se bat pour changer le monde, pour changer l’Europe, qui se bat pour ses valeurs, qui se bat pour ses idéaux.”

the concepts of “strong France” and “construction” to arrive at the complex metaphor France Is A Fortification. In the opening section of his campaign speech at the Parc Chanot in Marseille, Sarkozy proclaims:

Confronté tous les jours aux difficultés quotidiennes des Français, je me suis forgé la conviction qu’en tirant tous les fils de la politique, on remontait toujours à la France, que la France au bout du compte devait être le grand sujet de la politique et que l’on ne pouvait pas séparer la vie des Français du destin de la France, que l’on ne pouvait pas résoudre les problèmes des Français sans résoudre ceux de la France, *que la France était au final le seul rempart grâce auquel on pouvait protéger les Français.*

Constantly confronted by the daily difficulties of the French, I developed the conviction that by pulling up all the strings of politics, one always climbed back to France, that the France must finally be the great subject of politics and that one could not separate the life of the French from the destiny of France, that one could not resolve the problems of the French without resolving those of France, *that France was, at the end, the last rampart thanks to which we could protect the French people.* (2)

Sarkozy employs the word “rampart” in order to conjure up the image of a fortified castle, implying that his political plans are those that would make the country strong and would literally defend the French people. Later in his speech, Sarkozy once again takes up this metaphorical theme, this time specifying the exact nature of the aforementioned “ramparts.” First, he lauds his first five-year term as France’s president: “For five years *France has leaned on these values, on these institutions to stay strong*” (6).¹³⁵ Here, French Values/Institutions Are Foundations. Then Sarkozy elaborates, this time vaguely assigning blame to others: “For too long *the values from whence springs the force of France have been abandoned* by those who had the responsibility *to defend them*” (7).¹³⁶ Echoing earlier metaphorical enunciations that stressed the significance of French values,

¹³⁵ “Pendant cinq ans *la France s’est appuyée sur ces valeurs, sur ces institutions pour rester forte.*”

¹³⁶ “Pendant trop longtemps *les valeurs d’où vient la force de la France ont été abandonnées* par ceux-là même qui avaient la responsabilité *de les défendre.*”

Sarkozy contends that Values Are Ramparts. In essence, Sarkozy has now presented a more concrete image of his perception of France as a Project by using the following logical chain of thought: France Is A Project, France Is A Construction, France Is A Fortification, Values Are Foundations, Values Are Ramparts. Additionally, Sarkozy reinforces these metaphors throughout his speech by impressing the unfinished nature of the French project. Lecturing his audience on the national debt, Sarkozy warns:

Quand on oublie la France, on oublie que l'État c'est tous les Français, que la dette de l'État et la dette des Français, c'est une seule et même dette, on oublie que l'on ne peut pas *bâtir une société et une économie prospères sur la ruine de l'État, ni la prospérité de l'État sur la ruine de la société et de l'économie.*

When we forget France, we forget that the State is all French people, that the debt of the State and the debt of the French people is one and the same debt, we forget that we can not *build a prosperous society and economy on the ruin of the State, nor the prosperity of the State on the ruin of the society and the economy.* (8)

In this passage, Sarkozy advances the metaphor Society Is A Construction, underscoring the collective nature of the French national debt and illustrating the metaphor by using key words like “build” and “ruin.” Finally, Sarkozy unites the collective units of French national identity into the overarching metaphor:

Je veux défendre ce patrimoine. Je veux m'opposer à toute dérive communautariste parce que cette dérive ruinerait des siècles d'efforts et de sacrifices *pour nous construire un État, une Nation, une République* dont nous pouvons être fiers dont nous tirons notre force et notre intelligence collectives.

I want to defend this patrimony. I want to oppose all communitarian deviations because this deviation would ruin centuries of efforts and sacrifices *to construct a State, a Nation, a Republic* that we can be proud of and from which we draw our collective force and intelligence. (10)

The former French president is decrying “communautarisme,”¹³⁷ a pejorative term that roughly corresponds to the same concept that Americans call “multiculturalism.”

¹³⁷ See note 117.

Sarkozy's persistent use of "we" and the term "collective" oppose themselves to the idea of "communautarisme," as the latter term is more associated with the fragmentation of society into specific and often exclusive ethnic groups. Most importantly, however, is Sarkozy's insistence that the State, the Nation, and the Republic are all social constructions resulting from centuries of ongoing efforts (including the sacrifice/destruction of one's regional language or culture), and his implication that the patrimony of these aspirations should be safeguarded and continued by French citizens today.

François Hollande also makes extensive use of the fundamental metaphor France Is A Project. He explicitly says as much at Marseille, when he declares: "Here is my project, it is the Republic" (10).¹³⁸ Hollande also employs the metaphor France Is A Construction, albeit in a manner different than that of his opponent when he stresses at Orléans:

Nous ne voulons pas affirmer notre existence par arrogance, mais nous considérons, sans doute parce que nous venons de loin, parce que nous avons surmonté des épreuves, parce que nous avons—et les plus anciens s'en souviennent—franchi des étapes essentielles pour *notre construction nationale*, nous considérons que nous avons un message universel à apporter. Nous ne nous vivons pas comme une exception mais *comme une construction qui peut inspirer d'autres...*

We do not want to affirm our existence by arrogance, but we consider ourselves, without a doubt because we have come so far, because we have overcome many tests, because we have—and the oldest remember—crossed essential stages for *our national construction*, we consider that we have a universal message to carry. We do not live as an exception but *as a construction that can inspire others...* (3)

In contrast to Nicolas Sarkozy, Hollande is speaking of a metaphorically constructed idea (national construction) rather than a physical construction (ramparts for defense).

¹³⁸ "Voilà mon projet, c'est la République."

Hollande references not only France's National Narrative by citing past "stages" and "tests" that have been met and overcome, but also evokes the spirit of the French revolution by pointing out the exemplary nature of the French project as an inspiring idea of universal values. François Hollande also links the metaphor of France Is A Project with the metaphor France Is A Dream, notably in his discourse at The Bourget in Paris:

Chers amis, j'ai parlé du Rêve français. Oui, le beau rêve, le rêve que tout au long des siècles, depuis la Révolution française, les citoyens ont caressé, ont porté. Ce rêve de vivre mieux, ce rêve de laisser un monde meilleur, ce rêve du progrès, ce rêve de pouvoir franchir à chaque fois les étapes de l'humanité, ce rêve ne nous appartient pas qu'en propre, mais il se trouve que *c'est nous, la France, qui avons inventé la République*.

Dear friends, I spoke of the French Dream. Yes, the beautiful dream, the dream that throughout the centuries, since the French Revolution, citizens have caressed, have carried. This dream to live better, this dream to leave a better world, this dream of progress, the dream of being able to break through the challenges of humanity, this dream does not belong to us in its own, but it finds itself in the fact that *it is we, France, who invented the Republic*. (26)

Here Hollande adopts an almost loving tone towards French history, speaking of a French dream that the people have carried and even "caressed." Addressing his audience with the first person plural "we," Hollande emphasizes the greatest project France has ever accomplished: the invention of the Republic.

At Marseille, François Hollande overtly connects the metaphor France Is A Project to the concept of national identity. Throughout his speech, he uses Marseille as a microcosm of the country as a whole, drawing parallels between the coastal city and the French nation. In the beginning of his speech Hollande erupts: "Marseille, the oldest city of France! *Marseille so intimately linked to the French nation*. Marseille, fashioned, *worked by the successive contributions of populations who constructed the city's*

personality and identity” (1).¹³⁹ First, Hollande links Marseille with the French nation as a whole so that by speaking of Marseille, he is in fact by extension speaking of France. Secondly, he summons the metaphor Marseille Is A Construction, molded and fashioned by the city’s inhabitants in a way that seems physical in nature. This is a subtle reference to immigration,¹⁴⁰ as Hollande is implying that the diverse populations residing in France also contribute to French national identity, shaping the “personality” of France in a material way.

Contrary to Nicolas Sarkozy, in Hollande’s unique version of the metaphor France Is A Project, the French project is not an ongoing physical construction, but rather a continuing book/story. At the beginning of his discourse at Bercy in Paris, Hollande blazes:

Je ne suis pas simplement le candidat d’un rejet – il est là¹⁴¹ – mais je veux aussi être l’affirmation d’un espoir, d’un projet, d’une volonté! *Nous avons ensemble à tourner une page, celle déjà trop longue d’un quinquennat d’échecs! Mais nous avons surtout à écrire ensemble une nouvelle page, à continuer la grande, la belle histoire de France* dont nous sommes ici, pas simplement ici, les porteurs, les messagers.

I am not simply the candidate of a rejection – he is there (in reference to Nicolas Sarkozy) – but I also want to be the affirmation of a hope, of a project, of a will! *We have to turn together a page, one already too long of a presidential term of failures! But above all we have to write together a new page, we have to continue the great, the beautiful history of France* of which we are here, not only here, the carriers, the messengers. (1)

¹³⁹ “Marseille, la plus ancienne ville de France! *Marseille si intimement liée à la nation française. Marseille, façonnée, travaillée par des apports successifs de populations qui ont construit sa personnalité et son identité.*”

¹⁴⁰ Marseille being a city of immigrants, the oldest city in France.

¹⁴¹ Hollande begins this excerpt with a pointed jab at Nicolas Sarkozy—the “he” referenced in association with “rejection”—while simultaneously defending himself: Hollande is asserting that he has the popular support of the French people on his own merits, and not merely because he is the “alternative” to Nicolas Sarkozy.

Hollande uses this critique of his opponent as the starting point for a more specific metaphor based upon France Is A Project: France Is A Book. This is a familiar metaphor, and readily incorporates already common perceptions of history as a long and ongoing chronicle. This metaphor also allows Hollande to kill two birds with one stone, as he pushes to not only “turn the page” from his predecessor, but also to “write a new page”—his own presidency. This same metaphor is also used during his speech in Marseille, where he concludes with the admonition: “Let us forget already the page that is in the process of being turned and let us write together the book of the Republic, in the name of France, in the name of the hope that we carry together!” (17).¹⁴² This idea of continued, collective renewal is not only poetically illustrated by the metaphor of a turned page, but also politically manifested by François Hollande’s campaign slogan: “Change is now!”¹⁴³

National Narrative

Metaphorical enunciations immortalize, synthesize, and preserve national events in a National Narrative that pervades peoples’ collective consciousness. Throughout the 2012 presidential campaign, both candidates use metaphor in different ways to evoke National Narratives inspired by their respective ideological affiliations. For example, Nicolas Sarkozy uses the base metaphor French People Are France to highlight the important contributions of distinguished individuals throughout France’s past. For his part, Hollande often unites the following three concepts under the base metaphor National Narrative Is A Construction: National Narrative, the French dream, and the

¹⁴² “Oublions déjà la page qui est en train de se tourner et écrivons ensemble le livre de la République, au nom de la France, au nom de l’espérance que nous portons ensemble!”

¹⁴³ “Le changement, c’est maintenant!”

republican promise.¹⁴⁴ Finally, both candidates use specific metaphors to describe the institution where they believe the National Narrative of France—and by extension French national identity—should be preserved and transmitted to future generations: school.

In Paris at the Place de la Concorde, Nicolas Sarkozy begins his speech with a metaphorical description of the scene before him: “Well, the immense wave that submerges today the heart of Paris carries this idea of France as an irresistible hope!” (1).¹⁴⁵ The three metaphors present here, People Are A Wave, Paris Has A Heart, and France Is Hope, are ostensions that signal to the audience that the information being communicated to them is particularly important. Sarkozy then continues: “You all are France!” (1).¹⁴⁶ The French president creates the strongest possible link between the French people and France by interconnecting citizens with the nation, and he further elaborates this metaphor with an extensive list of historical figures that reinforce the individualistic aspect of France’s National Narrative. Sarkozy declares:

Quand on entend la France, on entend MOLIERE, on entend VOLTAIRE, on entend CHATEAUBRIAND... Quand on parle de la France, on entend le cri de Valmy... On entend la voix de NAPOLEON... On entend le nom du Général De GAULLE, le 18 juin ! On entend la voix d’Aimé CESAIRE, ce grand poète, jetant RACINE, ZOLA et Victor HUGO à la figure des censeurs de Vichy!¹⁴⁷

When one hears France, one hears MOLIERE, one hears VOLTAIRE, one hears CHATEAUBRIAND... When one speaks of France, one hears the cry of Valmy... One hears the voice of NAPOLEON... One hears the name of General De GAULLE on June 18! One hears the voice of Aimé CESAIRE, this great poet,

¹⁴⁴ By extension, the metaphors The French Dream Is A Construction and The Republican Promise Is A Construction are equally valid.

¹⁴⁵ “Eh bien, la vague immense qui submerge aujourd’hui le cœur de Paris porte cette idée de la France comme une irrésistible espérance!”

¹⁴⁶ “Vous êtes la France!”

¹⁴⁷ Capitalized in the original text.

throwing RACINE, ZOLA and Victor HUGO in the face of the censors of Vichy!¹⁴⁸ (4)

Then Sarkozy delivers his final stroke: “We are the heirs of this France!” (4).¹⁴⁹ In essence, Sarkozy uses the metaphor French People Are Heirs Of France/France Is The Ancestor Of French People to make the assertion that French citizens actively fashioned the country’s past achievements and thus current French citizens inherit the duty to shape France’s future. Sarkozy continues his version of the National Narrative by reinforcing the idea of preserving a sacred heritage:

Et elle nous oblige, cette France: nous n’avons pas le droit, ici, place de la Concorde, de *laisser dilapider l’héritage de la France éternelle*! Nous les Français, nous ne voulons pas de la facilité, du renoncement, de la mollesse, parce que ce ne sont pas des défauts qui sont dans *les gènes de la France*!

And this France is our obligation: we do not have the right, here, at the Place de la Concorde, *to squander the heritage of eternal France*! We the French, we do not want easiness, renouncement, sluggishness, because these are not flaws that are in *the genes of France*! (Concorde 4)

According to Sarkozy, the historical transmission of the heritage of France is an eternal process. He illustrates this interpretation by characterizing this transmission as metaphorically biological in nature—just as a parent transmits his or her genes to a child, so too does France transfer her genes to the French people. This is the culmination of Nicolas Sarkozy’s National Narrative: France, who is all French people, who is a person,

¹⁴⁸ We have a list of literary and political heroes, most of which could be ideal figures of both ideologies. They are each figures of resistance, some of which are rather progressive, some of which are rather conservative. It is also worth noting that traditionally, French Presidents are men of letters: former President Valérie Giscard d’Estaing is a member of the prestigious Académie Française.

¹⁴⁹ “Nous sommes les héritiers de cette France!”

who is the illustrious French personages of the past, is the ancestor of all French people, and the heritage France has passed on to her citizens demands preservation.¹⁵⁰

At Bercy in Paris, François Hollande also reminds his audience that the French narrative is an inheritance that must be preserved by evoking his concept of “the French dream.” Moreover, Hollande directly associates the French dream with French national identity. Early in his speech he declares: “Yes, I want to revive the French dream, the beautiful republican promise, the spirit of conquest. Let us not search elsewhere our national identity!” (2).¹⁵¹ Hollande further clarifies:

Le rêve français, ce n’est pas une chimère, une illusion... Non ! Le rêve français, c’est la promesse républicaine, c’est notre récit, *c’est ce que les générations entières avant nous ont été capables de construire*, de proposer : l’aspiration à la promotion, à l’épanouissement, à l’accomplissement personnel dans la réussite nationale, que rien ne soit fait pour les uns sans que cela bénéficie aux autres, d’avoir de la solidarité entre nous et en même temps une capacité à donner à notre pays ce qu’il a de meilleur en lui-même, ses richesses, sa croissance, ses entreprises, son travail.

The French dream is the republican promise, it is our narrative, *it is what entire generations before us have been capable to construct*, to propose: the aspiration to promotion, to blossoming, to personal accomplishment within the context of national success, that nothing be done for some without it benefiting others, to have solidarity between us and at the same time a capacity to give to our country what it best holds within itself, its riches, its growth, its companies, its work. (2)

The socialist candidate has defined the French dream as both the “republican promise” and the “[French] narrative,” effectively linking these three concepts to French national identity—a term here mentioned explicitly. Hollande also engages the base metaphor National Narrative Is A Construction, reminding his audience that the French narrative is an ongoing process that must be continued. Moreover, Hollande provides a socialist

¹⁵⁰ The ideas of resistance and preservation illustrated in the preceding two metaphors recall the metaphors Values Are Ramparts and France Is A Fortress.

¹⁵¹ “Oui, je veux renouer avec le rêve français, la belle promesse républicaine, l’esprit de conquête. N’allons pas chercher ailleurs notre identité nationale!”

method for maintaining the heritage of the French narrative based upon the core concept (and republican value) of solidarity.

In the most foundational discourse of Hollande's campaign, the presidential candidate continues employing metaphors in order to further elaborate and integrate his conception of the French dream, the republican promise, and the French narrative.

Hollande begins by directly challenging his audience to recover something that must be restored, establishing the metaphor that The Republican Narrative Is A Lost Object:

Je vous appelle à retrouver le récit républicain, celui qui nous a fait avancer pendant des décennies, le récit de la Révolution française, de ces hommes, de ces femmes aussi, qui ont voulu avancer dans une histoire inconnue qui s'ouvrait sous leur yeux, qui était l'histoire de l'égalité humaine.

I am calling on you to rediscover the republican narrative, that which has made us advance throughout the decades, the narrative of the French Revolution, of these men, and of these women, who wanted to advance an unknown story that unfolded before their eyes, the story of human equality.¹⁵² (Le Bourget 27)

Hollande thus firmly roots the republican narrative in not only the common events of French history, but also in one of the republican values central to his entire presidential campaign: equality. Next, the socialist candidate implies that the narrative that must be rediscovered is still unfinished; in other words, The Republican Narrative Is An Ongoing Process. In essence, Hollande combines the concept of the unfinished narrative with that of the French dream in order to integrate his current project with France's past achievements. He affirms:

Oui, ce récit républicain qui s'est poursuivi avec les républiques, avec la IIIe République, avec, aussi, la Libération, le Conseil national de la résistance, ce rêve, ce récit républicain que Mai 68 a aussi, d'une certaine façon, fait ressurgir !

¹⁵² "Rediscover" the National Narrative because it was lost under the regime of Sarkozy, and his predecessor Jacques Chirac.

Et puis, mai 1981 et tant d'autres étapes.¹⁵³ C'est cela le récit de la République. Il n'appartient pas qu'à la Gauche. Tous ceux qui se sont succédé pendant des décennies à la tête du pays ont porté le récit républicain... Alors le rêve, surtout, portons-le!

Yes, *this republican narrative that continued with the republics*, with the Third Republic, with, also, the Liberation, the National Council of the Resistance, this dream, this republican narrative that May 68 also has, in a certain way, made resurface! And then, May 1981 and so many other steps. This does not just apply to the Left! All of those who have succeeded throughout the decades to the head of the country have carried the republican narrative... So the dream, above all, let us carry it! (Le Bourget 27)

In Hollande's "continued narrative," common, unifying events are carefully chosen and harmonized with specifically left-leaning events from French history in order to broaden Hollande's target audience from purely a socialist voting bloc to potentially the entire French electorate. Finally, Hollande articulates a series of repetitive explanations of the French dream, building up to a metaphor used to captivate the attention of the audience and to incorporate themes from socialist ideology. Hollande asserts: "The French dream is confidence in democracy, a democracy that will be stronger than the market, stronger than money, stronger than beliefs, stronger than religions!"¹⁵⁴ (Le Bourget 27). He

¹⁵³ Each historical reference has immediate connotations easily accessible to a French voter familiar with the country's past. For example, the Third Republic is often associated with the institution of the modern education system and is still France's longest-lasting Republic (70 years). The Liberation and the National Council of the Resistance reference the end of the Second World War; many of those who were instrumental in the success of the Resistance were communists or other French leftists. May of 1968 refers to the largest general strike in France's history that mobilized thousands of students and workers, bringing the economy of France to a standstill and causing to the dissolution of the National Assembly. In contrast, May of 1981 refers to the election of socialist president François Mitterrand, the first and only socialist elected to this office prior to the victory of François Hollande in 2012.

¹⁵⁴ "Le rêve français, c'est la confiance dans la démocratie, la démocratie qui sera plus forte que les marchés, plus forte que l'argent, plus forte que les croyances, plus forte que les religions!" The principle of according more social and political importance to democracy than religion dates back to the Third Republic and the 1905 law detailing the separation of the Church and State, based on the French concept of *laïcité*.

continues, referencing the republican promise: “The French dream is the achievement of the republican promise about school, laïcité, human dignity, and general interest” (Le Bourget 27).¹⁵⁵ Finally, Hollande utters the metaphor The French Dream Is A Crucible:

Le rêve français, c’est le creuset qui permet à toutes les couleurs de peau d’être à l’égalité de droits et de devoirs. Le rêve français, c’est l’affirmation des valeurs universelles qui vont bien au-delà des frontières, qui vont bien au-delà de la Nation... Le rêve français, c’est notre histoire, c’est notre projet!

The French dream is the crucible that permits people of all colors to be equal in both rights and duties. The French dream is the affirmation of universal values that go beyond the borders of France, that go beyond the Nation... The French dream is our history, our project! (Le Bourget 27)

With this metaphor, Hollande evokes a physical image of the French dream and intimates that all of its characteristics are in the process of being forged. The socialist contender also creates a link between the present idea of the French dream and the previously examined theme of French/Republican values. Hollande then concludes his anaphoric articulation with three metaphors, one of which is achieved by wordplay: “The French dream is a force, it is the project that I propose to you, because it resembles us, because it unites us!” (Le Bourget 28).¹⁵⁶ In the first part of this statement, François Hollande advances two metaphors: first, The French Dream Is A Force and second, The French Dream Is A Project. In the second half of the enunciation, Hollande justifies his first two metaphors with a play on words: the French dream “resembles” (*ressemble*) the French people, and the French dream “unites” (*rassemble*) the French people—thereby creating the metaphor The French People Are A Force/Project.

¹⁵⁵ “Le rêve français, c’est l’achèvement de la promesse républicaine autour de l’école, de la laïcité, de la dignité humaine, de l’intérêt général.”

¹⁵⁶ “Le rêve français, c’est une force, c’est le projet que je vous propose, parce qu’il nous ressemble, parce qu’il nous rassemble!”

Both François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy agree upon the means by which the National Narrative is to be preserved and communicated: school. However, the two candidates advance distinct metaphors that express different qualities of the French educational institution. For Sarkozy, School Is A Forge/Factory, where children go to be transformed into French citizens. In Bordeaux, Sarkozy insists: “School, school is central for the Republic. School, *this is where citizenship is forged*. School is the place where intelligence becomes accessible, where judgment is formed, *where we construct ourselves*, where we even learn to live with others.”¹⁵⁷ Similar to France, the individual is also a construction, and school is the place where National Identity is designed and fashioned.¹⁵⁸ By using metaphors based upon “forging” and “constructing,” Sarkozy is implying two principles: First, that education is something done *to* the student, in a top-down process, akin to the forging of a weapon or tool by a blacksmith. Second, Sarkozy deliberately describes school as “where *we construct ourselves*,” implying that education still entails at least some measure of personal responsibility.¹⁵⁹

In comparison, in François Hollande’s discourse on the School and the Nation¹⁶⁰ at Orléans primarily applies the metaphor School Is A Promise: “Dear friends, I came here to speak to you about school, of the republican promise. Because the first promise of

¹⁵⁷ “L’école, mais l’école, c’est central pour la République. L’école, *c’est là où se forge la citoyenneté*. L’école, c’est le lieu où s’ouvre l’intelligence, où se forme le jugement, où *l’on se construit*, où on apprend même à vivre avec les autres.”

¹⁵⁸ This was the role also attributed to military service before it was abolished in 2001.

¹⁵⁹ Similar to George Lakoff’s central claim in *Moral Politics* (that Republicans and Democrats express their ideological positions based upon metaphors rooted in competing conceptions of family-based morality), Sarkozy’s conservative conception of education generally corresponds to the strict parent model.

¹⁶⁰ “Discours de François Hollande sur l’École et la Nation à Orléans”

the Republic is school.”¹⁶¹ For Hollande, education is an essential right, guaranteed by the Republic itself. He then elaborates: “Knowledge, expertise, school: these are not only expenses, these are investments.”¹⁶² Here Hollande employs the economically based metaphor School Is An Investment, contrasting with Sarkozy’s more physical metaphor of School Is A Forge/Factory and reinforcing the value of education as a key element of his presidential campaign.

¹⁶¹ “Chers amis, je suis venu vous parler de l’école, de la promesse républicaine. Parce que la première promesse de la République, c’est l’école.”

¹⁶² “La connaissance, le savoir, l’école: ce ne sont pas seulement des dépenses, ce sont des investissements.”

CONCLUSION

Les menaces qui attestent la fragilité de l'identité personnelle ou collective ne sont pas illusoires : il est remarquable que les idéologies du pouvoir entreprennent, avec un inquiétant succès, de manipuler ces identités fragiles par le biais des médiations symboliques de l'action.¹⁶³

—Paul Ricœur, *Parcours de la reconnaissance*

François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy both actively employed metaphors in their political discourses throughout the presidential campaign of 2012. The two presidential candidates shared three basic metaphorical constructions in common: France Is A Person, Values Are Important Components/Structures, and France Is A Project. Combined, these three foundational metaphors form the framework of each candidate's National Narrative—a retelling of French history with particular emphasis upon the importance of the preservation and continuation of a national heritage.

For Nicolas Sarkozy, the National Narrative dictates that the French people are the heirs to France-As-The-Sum-Of-Past-Achievements, and this ancestry demands a sacred duty to construct and defend France-As-A-Fortress (composed of Values-As-Ramparts) against the opposing forces of the “other.” Additionally, Sarkozy also invokes a sense of duty for the children of France to love and defend France-As-A-Parent/Mistress.

¹⁶³ The menaces that testify to the fragility of personal or collective identity are not illusory: it is remarkable that the ideologies of power undertake, with a worrying success, the manipulation of these fragile identities by means of symbolic arbitrations of action.

For François Hollande, the National Narrative is an idea constantly under construction, an idea that since its invention has been inscribed within the pages of a collective French book or story that is still being written. Hollande also identifies the French people as children of the nation, children under the protection of a universal, inclusive France-As-A-Parent. For Hollande, values are not static ramparts defending France-As-A-Fortress, but rather a progressive Force for social change. Finally, while both candidates staunchly rely upon the metaphor France Is A Person With A Soul, it is François Hollande who clarifies that “the soul of France is equality.”¹⁶⁴

The metaphorical analyses found within the body of this thesis reveal the establishment of a National Narrative designed to reflect each candidate’s perception of French National Identity. By carefully examining the candidates’ enunciations during campaign discourses according to the synthetic Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) outlined in the beginning of Chapter Three, it is possible to deconstruct complex metaphors into their constituent parts in order to scrutinize the distinctions made between the two candidates’ conceptions of French National Identity. Taken individually, most of the metaphors studied in this thesis do not definitively reflect ideological bias. However, viewed collectively, these metaphors constitute a National Narrative that reveals each candidate’s perceptions of French National Identity. By means of metaphor, François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy essentially illustrate the Soul of France: the common ideas, traditions, and values that serve as the core of their respective ideologies.

While many of the most fundamental metaphors that compose the National Narratives of each candidate are shared, the nuances manifested in the details of their

¹⁶⁴ “L’âme de la France, c’est égalité.”

metaphors are particularly revealing of ideological tendency. These distinctions are especially relevant to the stated hypothesis of this thesis:

Each candidate in the 2012 French presidential election used ideologically influenced metaphorical utterances in order to redefine national identity, thereby creating the largest possible Mutual Cognitive Environment within the French nation, thus attracting the largest potential electorate.

Due to the salience of these nuances, the hypothesis of this thesis may be confirmed to the extent that the subtleties of each candidate's metaphorical enunciations reveal latent ideological positions. Two particular cases expressing such nuances were presented in this thesis: the value of work and the institution of the school. In the first example, Nicolas Sarkozy used metaphors like *Work Is The Bedrock* and *Work Is The Means of Emancipation*, thus prescribing to the more conservative belief that work is an individual means to self-liberation. In contrast, Hollande's socialist credo was revealed when he applied the metaphor *France Is Divided In Confrontation* in order to advance his own belief that work is a unifying value that is universally guaranteed and shared. These fundamental ideological differences were also explicitly present in the candidates' remarks on education. Nicolas Sarkozy employed the metaphor *School is a Forge/Factory*, boldly indicating his top-down approach to education and his conviction that school is a place of individual self-construction. Alternatively, François Hollande asserted that *School Is A Promise and An Investment*, tellingly divulging his universalist approach to education and his penchant for official financial support to schools.

In conclusion, the intentional utilization of metaphors as a means by which to address the complex questions, controversies, and nature surrounding National Identity

reveals a rhetorical strategy that is extremely effective when attempting to discreetly approach a sensitive subject (or even taboo) without forcibly naming it (the term “National Identity” was only used a few times in the discourses examined above). In this study of the 2012 French presidential campaign, candidates François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy propose divergent definitions of French National Identity by constructing ideologically opposed versions of a National Narrative, facilitated and strengthened by metaphors. The collective body of metaphors that comprise the National Narrative comprehensively illustrates French National Identity by incorporating many of the diverse elements of National Identity into a cohesive whole. Most importantly, metaphorical enunciations simultaneously call attention to the Narrative being evoked and significantly enlarge the Mutual Cognitive Environment (MCE) shared between presidential candidates and the electorate by referencing more experiential domains of life readily accessible and easily comprehensible to the French public. French politicians and the electorate are both contributing to an ongoing narrative of National Identity that transcends the politics of the 2012 French presidential election, thus creating the imagined political community that is the French nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Andriamanana, Tefy. "Le débat sur l'identité nationale critiqué par une partie de la majorité." L'Express 29 October 2009. Web. 18 January 2013.
- Anonymous. *Prise de la Bastille et arrestation du gouverneur M. de Launay, le 14 juillet 1789*. Musée national du Château de Versailles. *L'histoire par l'image*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- Associated French Press. "Identité nationale: 50% de Français non satisfaits du déroulement du débat." 20 December 2009. Web. 18 January 2013.
- Barrès, Maurice. Les Déracinés. Paris: Bartillat, 2010. Print.
- Charaudeau, Patrick. Le discours politique: les masques du pouvoir. Paris: Vuibert, 2005. Print.
- "Communautarisme." *Socialinfo.ch*. Dictionnaire suisse de politique sociale, 2013. Web. 18 January 2013.
- "Communautarisme." *Larousse.com*. Larousse Dictionary, 2013. Web. 18 January 2013.
- Coroller, Catherine. "«Nous ne pouvons rester silencieux»." Libération 24 May 2007. Web. 18 January 2013.
- Courtine, Jean-Jacques. "Le tissu de la mémoire : quelques perspectives de travail historique dans les sciences du langage." Langages 114 (1994): 5-12. Print.
- Crawshaw, Robert and Karin Tusting. Exploring French Text Analysis. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. L'Archéologie du Savoir. Paris: Gallimard, 1969. Print.

- . Les mots et les choses. Paris: Gallimard, 1966. Print.
- . L'ordre du discours. Paris: Gallimard, 1971. Print.
- Gaulle, Charles de. Mémoires de guerre – L'Appel: 1940-1942. Vol. I. Paris: Plon, 1954. III vols. Print.
- Gingras, Anne-Marie. "Les métaphores dans le langage politique." Politique et Sociétés 30 (1996): 159-171. Print.
- Hollande, François. Campaign Speech. Le Bourget, France. 22 January 2012. Web.
- . "Discours sur l'École et la Nation." Orléans, France. 9 February 2012. Web.
- . Campaign Speech. Marseille, France. 14 March 2012. Web.
- . Campaign Speech. Paris, France (Bercy). 29 April 2012. Web.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. "Studying American Culture through its Metaphors: Dimensions of Variation and Frames of Experience." AMERICANA - E-Journal of American Studies in Hungary III.1 (2007). Print.
- Klein, Dr. Ernest. A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language: Dealing with the origin of words and their sense development thus illustrating the history of civilization and culture. Vol. II. New York: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1967. II vols. Print.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. Metaphors we live by. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. Print.
- Lakoff, George. Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think. 2nd Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002. Print.
- . "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." Ortony, Andrew. Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. Print.

—. The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics. New York: Penguin Books, 2009. Print.

Landrin, Sophie and Laetitia Van Eeckhout. "Fillon tente d'apaiser le débat sur l'identité nationale." Le Monde (2009). Web. 18 January 2013.

Le Nouvel Observateur. "Ayrault : "Il est temps d'arrêter les frais"." Le Nouvel Observateur 22 December 2009. Web. 18 January 2013.

Le Parisien. "Identité nationale : pour Juppé, les vraies questions éludées." Le Parisien December 2009. Web. 18 January 2013.

Libération. "Identité nationale: comment le débat a fait pschittt..." Libération 8 February 2010. Web. 18 January 2013.

"Metaphor." *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2013. Web. 18 January 2013.

Meyran, Régis. Le mythe de l'identité nationale. Paris: Berg International, 2009. Print.

Noiriel, Gérard. A quoi sert l'identité nationale. Marseille: Agone, 2007. Print.

Nora, Pierre. Les lieux de mémoire. Paris: Gallimard, 1997. Print.

Renan, Ernest. "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" Paris: La Sorbonne, 1882. Print.

Ricœur, Paul. Parcours de la reconnaissance. Paris: Stock, 2004. Print.

Rigotti, Francesca. "La théorie politique et ses métaphores." Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire (1990): 548-564. Print.

Salmon, Christian. Storytelling: La machine à fabriquer des histoires et à formater les esprits. Paris: La Découverte, 2007. Print.

Sarkozy, Nicolas. Campaign Speech. Marseille, France. 19 February 2012. Web.

—. Campaign Speech. Bordeaux, France. 3 March 2012. Web.

—. Campaign Speech. Villepinte, Seine-Saint-Denis, France. 11 March 2012. Web.

- . Campaign Speech. Place de la Concorde, Paris, France. 15 April 2012. Web.
- Schmitt, Rudolf. "Systematic Metaphor Analysis as a Method of Qualitative Research." The Qualitative Report 10.2 (2005). Print.
- Semino, Elena. Metaphor in Discourse. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.
- Sériot, Patrick. "Analyse du discours soviétique." Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations 40.4 (1985): 834-838. Print.
- Soanes, Catherine and Angus Stevenson, Concise Oxford English Dictionary. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. Print.
- Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. Relevance: Communication & Cognition. 2nd Edition. Malden : Blackwell Publishing, 1995. Print.
- . "A Deflationary Account of Metaphors." Gibbs, Raymond. The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 84-105. Print.
- Thiesse, Anne-Marie. "Des fictions créatrices: les identités nationales." Romantisme 30.110 (2000): 51-62. Print.
- Valentine, Mary. "Communiqué." 26 October 2009. L'immigration, l'intégration, l'asile et le développement solidaire. Web. 18 January 2013.
- . "Grand débat sur l'identité nationale : Eric Besson salue l'engouement populaire et annonce de nouvelles évolutions du site Internet." November 2009. L'immigration, l'intégration, l'asile et le développement solidaire. Web. 18 January 2013.

Vramulet, Marinela. "Le rôle de l'Environnement Cognitif Mutuel dans l'interprétation de l'énoncé métaphorique." Signes, Discours et Sociétés (2011). Print.

Wodak, Ruth. "The Discursive Construction of National Identities." Discourse & Society (1999): 149-173. Print.